FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

Congress of People's Deputies Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-134-S
Friday
14 July 1989

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
Congress of People's Deputies
Stenographic Record

FBIS-SOV-89-134-S *14 July 1989*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: The Daily Report is publishing the full translation of IZVESTIYA's "stenographic record" of the Congress of People's Deputies. Additional supplements will be issued as translated material becomes available.

STENOGRAPHIC RECORD

Congress Proceedings Continue 1 Jun 1
Eighth Session *[IZVESTIYA 3 Jun]* 1

Congress Proceedings Continue 1 Jun

Eighth Session

18300676 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Jun 89 Morning Edition pp 1-8

["USSR Congress of People's Deputies. Stenographic Record."—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text]

Eighth Session

1 June 1989. Kremlin Palace of Congresses. 1000.

Session chaired by USSR People's Deputy B.Ye. Paton, president of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Academy of Sciences and director of the Ye.O. Paton Institute of Electric Welding.

B.Ye. Paton: Respected deputies! "Today is the first Children's Protection Day. Today the 10th graders of the entire nation have sat down at their desks to write a composition. This is their first exam for the nation. Let us wish them creative inspiration and success in school and life. A great and complex life lies ahead of them. All the deputies should remember that we are working for our children, for them. Deputies from Tula Oblast." (Applause).

Respected comrade deputies, we are continuing the discussion of the question of the "Basic Directions of USSR Domestic and Foreign Policy." The floor is turned over to Deputy Ion Panteleyevich Drutse, a writer. The next to speak will be Boris Sergeyevich Mitin.

I.P. Drutse, writer, Moscow (Drokiya National-Territorial Electoral District, Moldavia): Respected comrade president! Respected colleague deputies! I would like to begin by making a protest against the Dnepropetrovsk deputy who from this rostrum claimed that he was the representative of the "homeland of stagnation." The entire world knows that this is not the case. Everyone knows that stagnation got off the ground in the Moldavian hills. (Stir in the auditorium).

In truth, it must be said that we acquired our renown in a completely unexpected manner. The problem was that, at an advanced age and while extremely ill, Josef Vissarionovich [Stalin] wrote on a slip of paper: "We must immediately help the Moldavian comrades in strengthening their leading cadres." This slip of paper lay in the appropriate file for appointing leading cadres—a file which, it must be said, had little to offer for mortals who saw it with their own eyes. And so Leonid Ilich Brezhnev was appointed to Kishinev as the first secretary, and then followed a chain of appointments: Shchelokov, Chernenko, and Trapeznikov. You all are well aware of how this ended.

We held our funerals, we did what we had to without stirring up too much, as they say, and thought that was the end of it. But all of a sudden, even in the time of restructuring, several years ago, in digging in that file, they discovered the slip of paper on which was written help must be given to the Moldavian comrades in strengthening the leading cadres. And they sent to us Comrade Smirnov as second secretary of the Moldavian Party Central Committee. What could we do? Moscow is Moscow. It, as they say, has big eyes, and they see far. Voices flew about, everything was on the point of collapse, and speeches came one after the other. Well, we lived through that. Now the press has announced to the entire world that it turns out that the second secretary of the Moldavian Party Central Committee has committed grievous crimes and must be deprived of all powers and arrested. And again Moldavia becomes famous throughout the world. Everyone is looking at us, and wondering what are you doing here? And actually, what are you doing? After some more time, a new statement in the "Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet." It turns out that Comrade Smirnov was not guilty of anything, that it was a major mistake and again our Moldavia is famous throughout the world. The man was not guilty of anything and they—that is, you—in Kishinev were undermining him. I want to request the leadership of our nation and Mikhail Sergeyevich to write on this slip of paper—done. And do not send us anyone anymore to Kishinev to strengthen the leading cadres. During the years of Soviet power, we, Mikhail Sergeyevich, have grown up and we have our own worthy young people, and generally speaking, somehow we will muddle through. (Applause).

The second problem: We would like to ask Moscow to help us get rid of the ruins of stagnation. Of course, you can say that this is our problem. But we do not know how to get a handle on this question, and, to tell the truth, we do not have a box big enough to send all of it back to Moscow.

Now, if I can move on to a question on procedures which has been discussed here many times—for instance, voting has been discussed many times. Dear comrades, I want to tell you that it is embarrassing for me when the president of the world's first nation to send a man into space counts from the Presidium how many are "for," how many are "against," and how many "abstentions." This is unworthy of our great nation. But this is only part of the problem.

The second part of the problem consists in the fact that we are still confronted with the state-party apparatus which controls us very well and which thinks as follows: We must somehow contain the expressions of deputy will. It must be said that among us are many people holding major state posts. Next to them sit people from the very same region. Whether they want to or not, they must give some thought to how they vote. The neighbor sees this. In addition, there is, as they say, the pressure of the masses. Everyone has peripheral vision; you can see how many hands are raised, and you wonder whether you should raise your hand or not. They say that it will take a year to provide individual

voting. I want to turn to our technicians, engineers, scientists and ask them: Dear comrades, think up some method for us so that by the end of this congress so that we could in an individual manner vote on all the vitally important problems of our state.

We have been discussing the question of status for a long time. We have been meeting now for how many days, but in practical terms we still do not know our personal status or the status of our Congress of People's Deputies. To be blunt about it, I am not even certain whether we have the right to give General Rodionov an "order out of turn." If we come back (and in any event we will return) to the Tbilisi problem, it seems to me that it would be good if we heard at least briefly the minister of defense. And if the truth be known, I would also like to question the president of our—the chairman of the defense committee.

Dear Mikhail Sergeyevich, in the report you wrote that a period of disarmament is beginning and that we should resolve many acute political problems by peaceful means. But these, as they say, are our external affairs. But what about internal affairs? Are we really incapable today of resolving by peaceful means the conflicts which arise inside our country? Are we going to go on all our life working out two policies: one, as they say, for the West, and another policy for domestic consumption? I feel that if the authorities of one or another region, oblast, republic or city turn out to be incapable of managing the masses, the emotions and problems of their population, then they of course should be retired and their places taken by those persons who will be capable of finding a common tongue with their population.

In this context I submit for your review a draft decree on the use of force against our own citizens and this states: to ban in the future the use of military force, having in mind regular troop units as well as the special detachments of the Interior Troops, obliging the local authorities to resolve all problems by political means. (Applause).

But let us return again to the Dnepropetrovsk-Moldavian affairs. What is stagnation? We have been fighting against it for countless years and we still cannot establish what stagnation is. From my viewpoint stagnation is the disintegration of the nation by the recruitment and confirmation of personnel following the negative principle in the sense that a person is less worthy of his position the more strongly he holds onto his chair and does not release it under any circumstances. (Applause).

For how many years have we been playing charades? Let us assume that the place of the minister of culture has become vacant. We have a cultivated country, many people read, and everyone is wondering: Who do you think it will be? There is one possibility, a second, a third, but no one fills the post, and there is no minister for 6 months. Well, we grow accustomed to this, and ultimately the deputy minister is not bad. All of a sudden, after a major football match, when everyone has forgotten about this, there is a small release in the "On the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet." Comrade Pilyulkin has been appointed USSR minister of culture. Then, 6 months later, it turns out that Comrade Pilyulkin is a very well known person, but has difficulty distinguishing between the dramatic theater and the opera, and we are put under conditions where the culture figures of the gigantic nation try to help him so that he can master the job he has been appointed to fill. In truth, among them are magnificent students. Everyone recalls the deceased Yekaterina Alekseyevna Furtseva, who also had little knowledge of opera and drama but later on came to the defense of our culture and was generally a fine leader in this area. But this should not become a system. Or, let us assume, the position of the minister of water management and reclamation has come vacant. Everyone is perfectly aware that water problems are the most acute both in the south and in the center of Russia and for all cities. But there is no appointment. For a long time there is no one. Later, suddenly among the graduates of the Higher Party School they find one who was a water transport worker. Without fail he is appointed the minister of water management. (Applause). Further years-long debates begin. The flower of our nation debates water problems with him but for him, the poor man, water remains an enigma.

I want to say that if the Congress of People's Deputies does not establish a special commission for the recruitment, placement, and approval of leading cadres for our nation, then we are not worth a farthing and we have assembled here in vain. Because again each morning we will puzzle out the same charades and suddenly discover that the ambassador to the Ivory Coast is also to serve as the ambassador in Paris. We will sit there wondering what caused this.

Let me return again to the major question of Tbilisi. Of course, we have set up a commission. I should say that it is a major danger that we are constantly setting up commissions. Something happens and a commission is established as some sort of exorcism, and something else and again another commission. Comrades, did the Chernobyl commission settle anything much? Did not the same ulcers as before remain after the formation of this high-level commission? The main problem, from my viewpoint, of Tbilisi is the following: We all should decide—and no commission will decide this—what happened in Tbilisi. What went on there? If this was a revolt in the borderland of a major state, then it actually should be brought to heal. Or was this a holiday of national rebirth? Then we must not move against this with combat engineer shovels or gas tanks.

Personally, I feel—and Mikhail Sergeyevich, speaking in Kiev, said—that this is a national rebirth. We must find our own final attitude toward this because the nation is in turmoil and we are all looking and listening. Approximately the same situations existed in Riga, Kishinev, Lvov, Kiev, and elsewhere. Don't forget that we have many republics and don't forget that we have many military districts. In addition to the Transcaucasian, we

also have the Odessa Military District as well as the Carpathian and Baltic Military Districts, and heaven forbid that at our next session we must hear from this rostrum the explanations of the district commanders on what happened in Riga, Vilnius, Kiev, Kishinev, Lvov, and so forth. (Applause). For precisely this reason, without disbanding the established commission, I again invite you to return and work out your attitude to what happened in Tbilisi—a revolt or a holiday of national rebirth.

Now on the language question: This is precisely what now concerns virtually all our national republics. It must be said that the Russian-speaking population has rather nervously received our concern about language, be this in the Baltic, Moldavia, or other regions. Everyone is asking how did this get started? I want to say that all of this started, as Metropolitan Aleksey said yesterday in his, from my viewpoint, excellent speech, from spiritual impoverishment. I would say, with spiritual degradation. And it has involved not only our republics but has also Russia to a varying degree. The Russian language has suffered as much as our minority languages have suffered. Every cultivated man knows that between the Russian language of Chekhov and Tolstoy and the current Russian language of the newspaper PRAVDA or any other of our newspapers, there is approximately the same difference as between the tsarist gold ruble and our present paper ruble.

So the degraded part of this language plus the every-day obscenities and swearing poured into the linguistic elements of our republics and formed what the Belorussians widely called "trasyanka"—that is, a mixture of wheat and chaff. This is precisely in what we converse in in nearly all the republics—in Belorussia, Moldavia, and the Baltics. Why does this bother us? Many people have passed through the world and perished without leaving a trace. Much has been written about the reasons for their demise. The Old Testament states on this issue: There is life and death in language. The ancient Jews established that the weakest, most painful and delicate place of any people is their language—that is, that bridge by which our terrestrial element moves into the spiritual. Of course, our concern for language is dictated primarily by the fact that no living thing can accept its death. A living organism cannot accept its death, and a living nation also cannot accept the degradation of its language. We are grateful for the fact that the center has somehow understood this concern of ours, and in many republics the language of the indigenous nationality has already been declared the state language and the others should also immediately be established in this quality. In truth, a delicate problem has arisen and was raised here yesterday by Deputy Oleynik from the Ukraine; it is bilingualism.

In actuality, we must employ a state mechanism for saving the national languages. At present, no other means will do. But the declaring of both languages to be equal official ones means "a tribute to your grandmother." And this means that they spoke a mixture and you will speak a mixture. (Applause).

Moreover, I feel that the great Russian language—and I consider it my second native language after Moldavian—has moved and is moving throughout the world upon its own authority, upon its own flight, and it is unlikely that anything would be added to Russian if in each of our 14 republics it is given the status of an official language.

In conclusion I would like to say that we, the deputies who underwent direct elections—and very complicated ones—should state to our deputy friends who were elected from the state institutions that we, although standing before you in ordinary clothes, we all, dear friends, are scarred and wounded. It was very heavy "fighting" and the fighting did not come from the local population. It was precisely due to their support that we are now in this auditorium. We fought against the apparatus. (Applause).

And for goodness' sake, don't think that the apparatus is just several state leaders who drive around in Chaykas. Of course, this is also the apparatus. But the apparatus is the brigade leader from a distant village, the party organizer, and the person who does not know what function he is to perform and who holds the entire mass of the people in his hands and before whom the people quake. Today, when we are meeting here, it, this apparatus, is spreading throughout the nation that the results of the elections are to be explained by the consumption of a surplus amount of nitrate in the vegetables and by the early sunny spring which caused the complete debauch of the genetic system. Because of this nonsense, you realize, the people emerged from their obedience and elected us their deputies. Yes, I am ending.

At present our voter stands in front of these local authorities and must ask if there is any milk and what he needs on the farm and is told: And for whom did you vote, blockhead? Well then, go to him and let him give it to you. (Applause).

I feel that if we truly are the representatives of the people and a higher power, then we certainly should take these simple persons under our protection.

And, finally, two forces which formed this spring—the awakened people in the form of the Congress of People's Deputies and the party-state apparatus. I am finishing....

I feel that Mikhail Sergeyevich is confronted with the difficult task of choosing one of these two: either or. I profoundly respect Mikhail Sergeyevich; I am fond of him and hope that he will side with the offspring of his life, restructuring. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: Comrade deputies, the floor is turned over to Deputy Mitin. The next to speak is Comrade Niyazov.

B.S. Mitin, rector of the Moscow K.E. Tsiolkovskiy Aviation Engineering Institute, Moscow (from the USSR Trade Unions): Comrades, I have been elected from the

trade unions but I am speaking here on behalf of the more than 200 delegates who are the representatives of the education sphere at our congress. We have devoted a great deal of time to debates on the political portion of restructuring and to its economic aspects, as this truly is a crucial moment. But the general plan of restructuring states that the basic means for achieving these goals will be an acceleration of scientific-technical progress and an accelerated introduction of its achievements into the national economy. Education is to play the determining role in this process.

Yesterday a group of deputies from the education sphere distributed among you a brief statement on the state of education in the nation and its tasks. Since possibly not all deputies had an opportunity to become familiar with this and the television viewers certainly did not, I will read only a brief excerpt. In 1963, some 25 years ago, the U.S. Commission on Science and Technology wrote the president that the prosperity and defense capability of the nation were determined not by raw materials, and not by mineral natural resources or even by capital. The decisive source of economic growth more and more was becoming knowledge, as well as the individual ability to use it. The agents and sources of new knowledge are the scientists, designers, engineers, physicians, teachers and other specialists, and for this reason the center of gravity in the political, military and economic rivalry of the world powers is shifting more and more into the educational sphere. A nation which does not possess an educational system capable of training highly skilled personnel inevitably will fall behind in equipment and technology. It has no chance of success in a political rivalry.

I, comrades, can tell you officially that the state of our educational sphere cannot support the strategic tasks of restructuring. At present, the leading nations of the world spend 10-12 percent of their state budget on educational purposes. And we spent 5-6 percent both in 1956 and at present. Our education sphere is in a very severe state. But in the most severe are its inferior levels, particularly the rural school. I will not give all the depressing figures but will say just one thing: Two-thirds of the rural schools do not have elementary amenities, without mentioning all the rest. For this reason, we are right to pose before both the government and the party the question that we must immediately double expenditures on education. These will not be empty outlays. (Applause).

A majority of us consider ourselves to be the direct heirs of October. I would like to remind you of a decision of the People's Commissariat of Education in 1918. I do not feel that at that time the situation of the Soviet Republic was easier than it is now. But then the Sovnarkom [Council of People's Commissars] decided not to cut back on the expenditures of the People's Commissariat of Education but resolve to give some consideration on how it could reduce expenditures of the other departments in favor of education. And this policy was actually carried out. Regardless of all the repressions which our people suffered before the war, the surviving portion of the intelligentsia made an inestimable contribution toward ensuring our victory in the Great Patriotic War. (Applause).

The question always arises of "where is the money to come from?" I, comrades, would be very cautious in determining from this rostrum the spheres where something must be cut. We don't want the next generations to say of us: "They were evil people and they solved their problems at our expense." The main source of funds which we should obtain can be seen in reducing our losses from mismanagement, and there are scores of billions here. (Applause).

Comrades, the next question is the computerization of education. I cannot even say what our place is in the world for this question. But it is clearly in one of the last. Regardless of the government's decree on the necessity of strengthening our industrial ministries by the accelerated computerization of our education sphere, this task will not be carried out over the next 5 years. And it must be carried out immediately. The USSR minister, Comrade Peregudov, at a meeting with workers from the education sphere before the congress said that there is a real agreement with an American firm for solving this problem in 12-18 months. One billion dollars will be required to carry out this agreement.

Yes, this is a major investment. If it is made, we will not obtain an improvement in the situation on the consumer market tomorrow. But if this is not done, then we and our children will be wearing foreign-made clothing and footwear for the rest of our life. The most important thing is to purchase the foreign machines and this we are doing.

Where is the money to come from? Here it is an easier question. According to the data of Goskomstat [State Statistics Committee] which is suspected of concealing data, last year alone uninstalled imported equipment froze 5 billion gold rubles. And if we recall that we have our own petrodollars, then we will understand that they were not invested here. For this reason, regardless of all the seeming enormity of the amount, I request, comrades, support for this proposal and above all to computerize the school and the humanities sphere of the higher school. The technical VUZ's are endeavoring to earn the money themselves if there will be a normal economic mechanism. (Applause).

A third question: We are speaking about cost accounting. What does cost accounting now mean for the educational sphere? It is a shame to say, but individual leaders of the local soviets are already beginning to enter into cost accounting relations with the schools. They are required to pay even for the transporting of firewood. So here, comrades, is a major question for you. Under conditions of cost accounting, to provide the possibility for the normal development of the education sphere using legislative, legal measures.

A last question, comrades. What is the status of teachers in our society? Of course, after those facts which were given here by Academician Likhanov on what the status is of our comrades working in museums, libraries and so forth, seemingly the situation of the teacher whom we call "people's" would be much better. But still, comrades, the moral state of a society can be judged from how it considers a person who has been entrusted with the upbringing and education of children. In our nation the wages of teachers are below the national average. And I feel that it is our common task to see to it that this not be the case. A teacher has no other additional sources of income. He cannot join a cooperative, and he cannot, as a rule, engage in a private trade. He does not have the time for this and possibly neither the ability. He is destined for something else. For this reason when a society distributes benefits, it should give some thought to whom these benefits should actually go.

During all my life I have never heard an announcement where a certain city or rayon had built even a simple 5-story modular building specially for teachers or nursery workers. This has never happened. Nevertheless, even now, including in Moscow, they continue to build highly comfortable, full-amenity buildings for workers of the management sphere. When people compare these two facts, then they can determine what priorities have been selected by our leadership. A teacher has an opportunity to have leave once in 35 years. Again we do not build sanitoriums specially for teachers and so forth. Now Mikhail Sergeyevich has stated that a commission will be set up for privileges. I consider that this is correct, such a commission should exist. Then we will see that we can find many reserves among the already existing recreational facilities. I request support for our proposal that a portion of these be allocated completely for workers of the educational sphere. (Applause).

One last thing about privileges. There is one, in my view, most unjust privilege that we are again extending to the leading workers in the management sphere. As a result of this privilege, a book—the source of knowledge and its best examples—come under house arrest. What I mean is that there are persons who from a list can order and receive monthly the finest books. I am a deputy from the social organizations. I happen to travel throughout the entire nation, and I hear that the first complaint of the teacher is not even that he lives poorly and that his wages are low, but that he cannot buy a book which he needs for working with children. So, comrades, this privilege is used by approximately several tens of thousands of our citizens. I feel that if we were to redirect this list to the rural libraries, then we could even now really aid the cause of education. This would not even require any material expenditures. I also have a proposal for the congress delegates: Let us try with ourselves (in truth, I do not have this list) and see how difficult it is to give up privileges. Approximately 500 persons at our congress have such lists. Forward them now to the rural schools so that even before the end of the congress we will have received telegrams of thanks that they have reached there and will be used. (Applause).

Comrades! I have been assigned to request the congress to support the proposal of setting up a separate education committee. I have said that there are over 200 of us. Some 17 have been elected to the Supreme Soviet and they have given their agreement to work on this committee. And it should be a committee because it would be intercameral. Because of the lack of time I will not take up the issue of what a role is played by the educational sphere in resolving nationality questions.

Comrades, I have made my report as I was instructed. But I still have a minute for personal comments. I am deeply grateful to Boris Ilich Oleynik and to other comrade deputies who recalled Russia. Yesterday before the end of our session I was profoundly concerned by the statement of our respected chairman, Comrade Brazauskas, that we have not turned over the floor to two other republics—Moldavia and Turkmenia. But what about Russia? Will the representatives of Russia speak, and what awaits Russia under the conditions of restructuring? Here I would like to hear comments by either Comrade Vorotnikov or Comrade Vlasov. Because, for example, the idea of the Baltic comrades of regional cost accounting as applied to Russia and for a number of other questions seems very attractive to me. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

V.Ye. Paton: The floor is now turned over to Deputy Niyazov. Deputy Likhanov will speak after him.

S.A. Niyazov, first secretary of the Turkmen CP Central Committee (Ashkhabad Rural Territorial Electoral District): Respected comrade chairman, respected people's deputies! The representatives of our republic are acutely experiencing the process of establishing the new Soviet parliament. We all wanted there to be a business-like discussion at our congress, that various ways be proposed and optimum decisions taken on the most crucial questions. What at first glance seemed to be nonstop disputes obviously was a natural process on the path to unity and consolidation. This was the case for virtually all questions and as a result we have reached a unanimous decision supported by an absolute majority of the deputies and in fact we can report that our congress is a congress of the nation's soviets. We must—we are obliged to—work out uniform tactics considering the interests, particular features, and specific conditions of the regions.

Marxism is based on facts and not possibilities, said V.I. Lenin. If we see that the rebirth of the party's authority is possible only by the uniting of party and state power in the hands of the leader of restructuring, then we say that these are the tactics which we require now. If we see that the exacerbation of interethnic relations and the clashing interests of various strata of society are a fact of our life, then we choose the tactics of unity and consolidation. If we see that except for the party there is no real force capable of advancing restructuring, then we vote for its consistent line of democratizing society.

Here there has been criticism of the so-called majority. Attempts to explain its position by obedience and dependence upon the apparatus are naive and, I would say, nondialectical. Why do certain comrades so want to mix up yesterday and today? Why do they not want to see that with all the imperfection of our apparatus it does have sober, healthy forces which must be supported by careful and painstaking work? Why is there this humiliating overtone which is invested in the word apparatus if not to reap political dividends and manipulate public opinion?

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev put it correctly in his report: We must proceed from the realities of today. We will not take a single step forward if we do not incorporate in our tactics a consideration of the political diversity of the moment. Specific social processes are occurring in each region and in each republic. It would be a major error to reduce these to some uniformity. But today we can feel a tendency for a leveling of the restructuring processes and at times even the imposing of political models.

We respect the search of the Baltic republics, their search for a sovereign path of development, and we respect the position of all deputies who starkly pose the problems of society and the problems of our congress. However, along with all of this we would like to see the presence of a more weighed, more systematized, differentiated approach to the problems of a multinational state. Certainly, the Central Asian region is not all the same. Each republic in its own way is implementing political, social and economic programs. I have in mind those deep vital seams which in each region are developing under the impact of historical, territorial and national-psychological features.

Not characteristic of our people is a desire for national exclusiveness, and there are no historical roots for this. The consolidation of the Turkmen nation occurred after October, and our development was aided virtually by all of Russia, by all the peoples of the nation, and particularly by the Russian people. We have developed a strong bilingualism. I do not agree with Comrade Drutse when he compares the bilingualism of the different regions and makes an assessment for the nation as a whole. We feel that for us bilingualism is the most appropriate, as living in our republic are 12 percent Russians, 7 percent Uzbeks, 3 percent Kazakhs, from 1 to 2 percent Armenians, Azeris, and Ukrainians, and others. At present, we consider it ill-advised to split the republic, declaring the status of a certain language. On this question we have sought the advice of our people.

We share that particular concern with which certain deputies have spoken of the social disasters of the nation. They are also a severe burden for our republic. Our scourge is high infant mortality, the social backwardness of the countryside, and the demographic defects. And possibly as nowhere else the status of woman is difficult. In the republic a serious disproportion has developed in the structure of the national economy and industry. Sectors of union specialization were developed predominantly, and these were focused on producing and supplying other union republics with gas, oil, chemical products and cotton. Their development was carried out often to the detriment of the ecological situation. At the same time, the sectors which should have served the internal requirements of the republic economy and population developed extremely slowly, and this led to a substantial lag behind the supply level of consumer goods, in terms of the development level of the social and production infrastructure. On a per capita basis, we produce consumer goods worth only 353 rubles. This is 3 1/2-fold less than the union average. The republic's population has a shortage of cotton textiles, although Turkmenia holds first place among the cotton-growing republics in terms of per capita cotton production and just 3-5 percent of the produced cotton is processed here.

Our republic promptly fills its obligations to the fraternal republics in terms of the delivery of cotton fiber, natural gas, petroleum product, chemical, vegetable, melon, and other product; however, we are frequently confronted with the fact when, by referring to a decision of the labor collective councils, our enterprises are partially or completely refused delivery under allocation of raw materials for light industry which are essential for the Turkmen enterprises. For example, this applies to cotton thread and leather goods, as well as machinery and equipment and other products. Even those to whom we deliver our raw materials refuse. For example, we send 35,000 tons of cotton fiber to the Ukraine, but this year we were unable, according to the allocations, to receive 230 tons of thread which, incidentally, was produced from our cotton fiber.

We realize that the development of market relations, and particularly with the conversion of regions to self-management and self-financing, is more and more being determined by contractual relations concluded under mutually advantageous conditions as well as equivalent exchange. But at present there is no such mechanism. There is state regulation of the deliveries of many types of products by using allocations but this procedure is not observed. The republic workers do not understand how this is possible in a nation and in a unified national economic complex to put the republic dependent upon whether an enterprise wants to carry out its duties and deliver its products to the region. We feel that such a situation is abnormal and we are hopeful that the new government which we are electing will take a special look at these questions. Both we and a certain portion of our leaders for this reason have proposed seeking consumers for our products overseas and purchasing the goods and raw materials we need there.

The imperfection of the structure is also felt on the employment of the able-bodied republic population and on the size and skill level of the working class. At present in the republic, for every 1,000 persons there are just 69

persons employed in industry, in comparison with 130 as the national average. The social division of labor should not lead to economic damage in the development of the economy of the individual regions, or to a reduction in the standard of living of the population. The existing procedure for calculating national income puts in a disadvantaged position those regions which produce and deliver raw products and semifactures in relation to the regions which produce finished products. In our view, there must be an adjustment of this method and above all in the method of calculating the turnover tax. The turnover tax should be levied at the point where the taxable product is produced. However, there should be a redistribution of the turnover tax between the suppliers of the agricultural raw materials and the producers of the finished product.

Now several questions related to the integrated development of the regions. The union ministries approach the utilization of natural resources often from purely departmental interests, permitting irretrievable losses of many valuable side-products. As part of the natural gas produced in the republic, each year over 1 million tonnes of ethane, a raw material for producing polyethylene, is extracted and not effectively used. With the aim of increasing the integrated use of natural resources, we consider it advisable to institute a payment for natural resources. One of the elements of this mechanism could be the setting of deposit prices which would consider all the components comprising it.

Respected deputies! A unity of social goals in the development of the nation as a whole presupposes the necessity of a guaranteed minimum of material support for the citizens as well as national employment of the labor resources. In our republic these questions are very acute. In line with the conversion of all enterprises to cost accounting, the problem of ensuring employment for the labor resources is becoming even more acute. In our view, the functions of supervising the ensuring of a guaranteed level of material goods and establishing the necessary number of jobs should be assumed by the Supreme Soviet and particularly the Soviet of Nationalities. Using funds from the union budget, long-term specific programs should be financed for the social development of the individual territories. A solution to the questions of the internal union division of labor between the republics is closely tied to a solution to the problems of forming an equivalent interrepublic exchange of product. This will determine the prospective specialization of the region and the standard of living of its population. A solution to these questions will make it possible to overcome possible contradictions in the interethnic ties.

We must also grant the union republics the right themselves to dispose of above-planned product. For example, this year we produced 30,000 tonnes of cotton fiber above the plan. This is the equivalent of producing 10,000-12,000 tonnes of dressed meat. In selling the above-planned share of cotton fiber—for example, in the socialist countries—the republics could have improved the supply of consumer goods for the republic using the foreign exchange earned by this, as well as solved other financial and economic questions.

When the union ministries and departments are working out the initial data for planning the production volumes for their enterprises located on the territory of a republic, we must strengthen the role of the union republics. We feel that these indicators, even before the elaboration of the five-year plan, should be coordinated with the union republic councils of ministers. And, of course, it cannot be considered normal that our union enterprises deduct 1 percent of the obtained profit into our republic's budget while the proportional amount of capital investments channeled by them into social development is 6-8 percent of the volume of production construction.

Comrades! We have set out to rectify the anomalies which have been left to us as a heritage by distant and not distant history. But can we correct everything in a single rush, in a single sweep? We would be bad strategists and politicians if we forgot about tactics and about carrying out our economic, social and nationality policies, now on the basis of possibilities.

Democratization raises the question of deepening the independence of the republics and their greater responsibility for the fate of our union. But here, I feel, we often forget the dialectical priority of unity. This is our political concept. The previous dogmatic interpretation of this is now hopelessly out of date. We need new approaches, and new tactics, and it is for this reason that restructuring is under way. In a condensed form this was spoken of in the report of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev as well as in the speeches of comrades.

We support the provision of the report on the election by the congress of a commission to review proposals concerning supplements and amendments to individual points of the USSR Constitution and, having worked through them, to submit them to the USSR Supreme Soviet for subsequent review at the next Congress of People's Deputies.

In concluding my speech, I would like to voice profound satisfaction with the efficient activities of the CPSU Central Committee and the government, and Mikhail Sergeyevich personally, in carrying out our foreign policy course and in strengthening good-neighborly relations with all countries and particularly with adjacent states. Turkmenistan, in bordering Iran and Afghanistan, is particularly interested in this. We are confident that the constructive steps by our nation on international questions will provide us an opportunity on a mutually advantageous basis of cultural and economic collaboration on many problems related to improving the utilization of natural and raw material resources of our countries. I thank you for the attention. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: The floor is turned over to Deputy Likhanov. Deputy Sharipov will speak next.

A.A. Likhanov, writer and chairman of the Board of the V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Fund (from the V.I. Lenin Soviet Children's Fund): Comrade deputies! And certainly we are deputies who are second and third in line while first in line are the daughters and sons, the mothers and fathers, the grandmothers and grandfathers! Why are we so willing to wean ourselves from starting over, from our initial purpose of ever more democracy, and possibly start from humanity from what parents and children we are, and dispense with the makeup and pomp in everything even down, so to speak, to the petty details—although I personally do not consider these petty details. Should we not now be ashamed of the cheerful juvenile couplets at the congresses, and other adult entertainments which include a certain good humor and moderate criticism of the leadership apparatus, an unworthy amusement for party members fatigued by logomachy? Children are never to blame; it is always the adults who are to blame and who permit the dependent part of society to indulge their feeling of parental concern for the small forces.

I would propose changing one of the clinging traditions, when at the Mausoleum during demonstrations, to touching applause, our leaders are presented with bouquets of flowers by model youths, and who then in exchange receive red boxes of candy and then, with their gifts, run to nearby rostrums to their excited and proud parents. The saying is correct that everything begins from childhood. Including lies. In purging such "details" with the truth, let us, without changing the procedure, have on the Mausoleum not anonymous symbols of prosperity but rather children beset by disaster. Possibly they could be given something more tangible, and instead ask their address, and a half year later, on the eve of a new demonstration, scribble a card to such a stripling; what do you think, comrade leaders? That is not so much trouble, according to the new electoral rules, and for each there would be no more than 2-score such godchildren, but quite a lot if we measured our life by such a human unit of measurement as the child's heart and the boy's eyes.

All my life I have dreamed that all our serious congresses and conferences of a fundamental, principled sort would start with statistics showing how the life of children and elderly had changed for the better—or for the worse! I have dreamed of a time when the annual and 5-year statistical reports along with tons of cast metal and square meters of new housing would print the sobering figures of our failures: how many children were in hospitals, how many children due to parental divorce had been left semiorphans—incidentally, 700,000 each year, comrades!—how many children we, the adults, had brought into the world who were unviable due to drunken barbarism, for medical skills, genetic problems and other adult sins. I greatly missed the concern for these disasters when I listened to your report, Mikhail Sergeyevich. There are 83 million children in the nation, almost one-third of society. But education is unstable and does not hold a prominent place in the budget, and I am not even mentioning morality and upbringing—so many pains and problems are there here. And again, as at the 19th party conference, there was only a hint of this in the report. Let the report last another 30 minutes, but the entire nation wants to hear the ideas of the authorities on this key question.

For many years we assured ourselves and continue to ensure ourselves with the happy notion that children are our future. But forgive me if we use the pronoun "our" then the children are our present. The discussions of the future of childhood have allowed us to put off until later the immediacy of the present disasters. Six thousand children die each year from cancer at present, and tomorrow even more of them will die if instead of the 800 beds for children with cancer the 3,000 required ones do not appear. The government has supported the proposal of the Children's Fund for building a rehabilitation Children's Oncological Center, and we have formed the public Program Hope to aid such children and their mothers, but so much kind-heartedness is required in this sadly tragic work, and where are we to find so much affection and self-denial? If there is blood donating, the transfusing of blood from one person to another, then it is a matter of honor for our society of a complete reworking of our conscience to establish spiritual donating, that is, help not in words but in deeds, a mature transfusion of strength and faith from the strong to the weak, from the old to the young.

In our nation—and unprejudiced common sense is to be thanked for this—charity is being restored. It is curious that the suffering child and our Children's Fund was first supported by the not-well-off part of our society—the elderly and the sick. Entire cloth sheets with frayed ends and tears were received from humble pensioners and from inhabitants of modern almshouses, and we realize that misfortune is best understood by those who have tasted it. Alas, some but very few leaders of culture and science have come to our side, those members of the Association of the Soviet Intelligentsia in the Defense of Childhood. Let me say frankly that there have been few of the marshals of our spiritual world. The worker collectives help actively. But most importantly, there are few average citizens. I do not blame them. Scientists debate the rise in prices and suddenly soap disappears, although industry produced 7 percent more than last year and charity is the victim. We were hoping for the working, active person and the cooperatives, and they did begin helping us, but then the draft law appeared on the taxation of such property, and I am afraid that again practical charity has been turned into fine words. But the children do not wait. They will grow up or not grow up. They need immediate social, moral, legal, medical and pedagogical aid. We hold an infamous leadership among the developed countries in terms of infant mortality, in competing for this bitter statistic, not with America, not

with Japan or Sweden, but rather the state of Mauritius, where in addition the rate of improvement in these matters is treble ours. They are at work on it.

Last year, a special team from the Children's Fund and the USSR Ministry of Health worked 80 days in Central Asia, Kazakhstan and certain oblasts of Russia. We saved the lives of 9,000 children. This is just the first steps, but I want to thank the 2,000 medical workers, basically women, for their voluntary charity and, in taking advantage of this TV forum, to urge physicians, feldshers [middle-level medical personnel] and nurses in whom civil dedication, thank God, has not been extinguished, to come to the aid of the children this summer. (Applause). Incidentally, about glasnost. During those 80 days last year, how many words in the press and on television were there about restructuring, about the need for a better life? But there were just a few comments on the quiet but charitable efforts of the 2,000 medical workers. But surely this work is a real patriotic feat worthy of support and analysis?

I would like to point out that—thank God!—we are developing not bad working relations with the USSR Minzdrav [Ministry of Health]. We have established the International Circle for Aiding the Young Victims of the Armenian Earthquake. Hundreds of children who experienced this are spending their summer vacations by invitation of foreign charitable organizations who are our partners. We are also proceeding on the programs "Children of Chernobyl" and "Children and AIDS." How terrible this is! Recently, we visited the children and mothers from Elista infected with AIDS. They are in a Moscow hospital. The children obviously don't understand what has happened, but for the mothers their despair knows no limit. And they, in essence, are completely unwanted. How long will this enforced seclusion go on—it is terrible to think—perhaps all their lives? What is the social status of these people? How will they live? Where? How will they work? With whom will they have contact, as people flee from them as from the plague? The wound, as they say, is open and bleeding, and as yet our society has no answer to the questions of the innocently suffering children. The old saying that a child does not cry, a mother does not understand should in our times be rephrased. The child cries—and this is well known to all, as twice in recent years the Central Committee and Council of Ministers adopted fundamental documents on orphans at the end of the 20th century—but the maternal power of the local soviets still does not understand that it is not enough to dress a foundling in new clothes and feed it; its life must also be cheered and warmed by humanity.

In olden times they reasoned as follows about help to orphans: Don't build seven churches—find a place for seven children. Now the orphan and generally the idle child, after a public-supported institution, is a public outcast if at first given some food—in essence is homeless. Where should they go? Who goes where? A majority to the vocational-technical school and, if there is a slight hitch, to the "dumbhouse," the so-called boarding school for the mentally retarded. I do not believe in the terrifying figure of 1,185,000 mentally incompetent children, although just a few days ago we were involved with the fate of a 22-year-old Muscovite, Igor Chernikov—he has permitted us to use his name. His mother abandoned him at the maternity home; the young fellow was disabled with a physical defect, but for disobedience, when he had grown up, the benevolent teachers enrolled him in a mental boarding school. And now for 20 years the normal fellow has been in a psychiatric boarding school for veterans and and disabled. He found strength in himself and got out, and we helped him with housing and his rights, but in essence, isn't this proof of our lack of sympathy? Here is a man without an education, without employment, with 26 rubles of pension for everything, and not a single relative around.

The USSR Council of Ministers has supported our idea of establishing family children's homes—to put it more accurately, guardian families and hostels. Today, on Protect the Children Day in Razan Oblast, the Children's Fund, together with the newspaper TRUD, is laying the foundation of the first such hostel. In Lithuania, Rostov and Saratov, the "families" of the fund, are already at work and thriving, but then the Public Education Committee has been unable to approve even a provisional regulation and things have clearly been held up. The traditions of the old Ministry of Education are clearly strong.

Over the last 3 years, the plans for building children's homes in the nation have been fulfilled by 44 percent, and infant homes by 40 percent. I wonder if we have any other quota in construction which has been fulfilled with such shameless neglect! At a recent session of the Bureau of the USSR Council of Ministers on social development, comrades Chekharin (Russian Council of Ministers), Makhamadaliyev (Uzbek Council of Ministers), and Sviridov (Turkmen Council of Ministers) stated that the boarding facilities which are planned for the five-year plan will still be built, but it is hard to believe this. A great deal can—and must!—be said about the children's disasters, to our great lament. What yesterday was simply overlooked or shamelessly crossed out now is becoming a catalyzing means in our general humanization. And it should! It is sad to admit, but we have fallen behind our social opponents not only in the area of motor vehicle building and services but primarily in the area of the practical realization of the finest human feelings. Just look how unsmiling we are, and how adroitly we elbow aside the weak and the silent, how uncourteous we are to women—incidentally, the enormous mass of men flees from the family if a disabled child is born, and the mothers are strangled by impotence and a lack of money, and as a result the state institutions in this area are full of beings who are completely abandoned. Where is our social humanism if over the last 5 years 1,795 women have intentionally killed their newborn children? The children leave home and become missing. You will agree that missing, in peacetime and—in addition—children, this is certainly a disaster.

Some 900,000 juveniles every year are apprehended for violating the law and vagrancy. The homeless children ["besprizorniki"] have reappeared. Child crime is growing. The children of the peoples of the north are dying from tuberculosis. Large families are suffering. I would like for the first time to release two truly tragic figures. In 1987, 1,299 children and juveniles were killed and another 2,194 ended their lives by suicide. In the spring, the Belorussian newspapers decried the fate of the 3d grader from Minsk, Sasha Anufriyev. He was killed in broad daylight. He was killed by a woman, the former wife of Sasha's stepfather, in revenge for having left her for another. Some have been offended by these comments, and some have considered this story a fact of a criminal story. But why do we so willingly waste millions of lines on the most unseemly issues, on trifles not worth the indignation of the entire world? Why have we, having quickly learned meeting-house democracy, not turned the burial of this child into a protest march against cruelty, into a march which would be transmitted by television throughout the nation?

Mikhail Sergeyevich, I turn to you, as the president, with a proposal for a weekly television appeal to the nation. Here we must thoroughly broaden the range of subjects of these appeals, having paid particular attention to the main moral questions of society. (Applause).

We will not restructure our life until we have reduced the pain threshold of our sensations. The most abandoned sphere of inner human relations in our nation is conscience. Having hastily rejected common human morality, we have not created a new morality for the simple reason that all moral underpinnings were already conceived a thousand years before us.

The well-being of the people cannot be instituted at the expense of conscience. Childhood is particularly brittle in terms of adult lack of conscience. For this reason we, the deputies from the Children's Fund, officially submit to the Congress as a legislative initiative a proposal to prepare a USSR Law Governing the Rights of the Child, and are ready to head this practical work. (Applause).

Let me inform the deputies that in the very near future the Supreme Soviet should ratify an international convention on the rights of the child, and this has already been prepared by the United Nations. At the same time, we do not have any analog. Generally speaking, our legislation is greatly in debt to childhood and the family, particularly large families. We also propose not to run together the concept "maternity" and "childhood"—since ancient times an inactive stereotype, but rather establish separately a Committee for Women's Affairs, and separately a Committee for Defending the Interests of Childhood and the Family, as a joint Committee of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities. This is supported by the women deputies. We also propose, in addition to the USSR Law on the Rights of the Child, to instruct this Committee to prepare a written report to the Congress of People's Deputies on the status of children in the USSR. Support, comrades, these proposals! Let me say again that children are our present. They can become the future only if we help them now. Tomorrow will be too late. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: The floor is given over to Deputy Sharipov. After him, Deputy Belov will speak.

Yu.K. Sharipov, general director of the Ufa S.M. Kirov Production Association, Ufa (from the National-Territorial Electoral District): Hello, comrade deputies! Hello, our dear voters. Our Bashkir delegation has empowered me to speak today. We are 29 persons here. And I would like to say that we have received notes and we have been phoned with the complaint that we are working poorly at the congress because we are not being shown on television. We are seated very far away, way to the back, and we are generally speaking a humble people, particularly from the autonomous republics. We do not stand around the microphones but this certainly does not mean that our deputies, including the Bashkir deputies, are not at work. I am making this statement to our voters from the Bashkir Autonomous Republic. This probably also concerns many other deputies who have not had the fortunate opportunity as I to stand here, on the rostrum, so I can be seen, and after this it is concluded that I am at work while the remaining 25 are supposedly not working.

Comrades, there are more than 2,000 of us, and certainly the nation has equally as many problems. So let each of us assume the share which he can of our common work. I promised in my program that I personally would work to see it that each Soviet family had a telephone. I do not know how things are with the other deputies, but in our delegation there are comrade deputies who have no telephone at all. Incidentally, raise your hands if you do not have a telephone. So you see, even deputies who should do a lot of work at home, unfortunately, have no telephone.

I, as the leader of an association which produces communications equipment, including modern electronic telephone exchanges, know that this is not so easy to do, as well as what problems have accumulated here. Some 30 percent of urban homes have telephones. In the countryside, it is just 10 percent. In order to pass on a message from village to village, one has to ride a horse or a tractor. There are 14.9 million unsatisfied applications, including over a million from disabled persons.

At the same time, I realize that the level of telephone service is one of the most important indicators for the social development of society, and this is an important prerequisite in developing information science and modern management in the country.

The telephone, if you wish, contributes to the development of glasnost and democracy. When our television invites us to take part in direct broadcasts on various problems, in announcing the telephone number of the studio, I am painfully aware that three-quarters of the

population has no such opportunity. Incidentally, a large amount of the population does not see these broadcasts, as many regions and villages are deprived of such an opportunity.

Comrades, this year our association will increase the output of automatic telephone exchanges by 2.3-fold. By 1991, we should again double it, and by 1995 we will be able ourselves to provide telephones for 1.8 million apartments. With this amount it is possible to provide full telephone service for seven cities with a population of a million. But even now our associated enterprises cannot keep up with us, and primarily the enterprises of the electronics industry. The Minelektrotekhprom [Ministry of Electrical Equipment Industry] is keeping the communications workers on starvation rations in terms of telephone cable. As an economist, I realize perfectly well that the providing of telephone service requires certain outlays. But with our "trishkinization," from the famous "Trishka's caftan" [pull a thread and unravel the sweater] with its well-known methods of repair, our budget will always lack funds, including for communications. We can find the many billions for the BAM [Baykal-Amur Mainline] and for reversing the course of rivers, but for this, no. But I propose using conversion in the MEP [Ministry of Electric Industry] and the Minelektrotekhprom [Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry], having focused the freed capacity on the needs of resolving this social problem. I propose setting up a number of firms, including one on the basis of our association, which would be fully engaged in producing communications equipment, "turnkey" installation and services. I also propose setting up a deputy initiative group for a national telephone service; I will take a most active part in its work and, if you have the confidence, I can even lead it.

A few ideas on improving the operation of enterprises. Without going into a criticism of the existing Law Governing Enterprises, let me say that its new version should proceed from the principle that the labor collective is the real master of the enterprise. In my view, there should be three types of enterprises: state-owned (this would include primarily defense enterprises and transport); the second type leased, which over time can be bought out completely by the collectives and become joint-stock; and the third the well-known cooperatives. I agree with the comrades who said that the law for all types of enterprises should be standard. Everyone pays taxes to the state budget, to the republic budget, and to the local budget. The amount of taxes should be set solely by law. For excluding the negative influence of the existing monopolies on the nation's economy, we probably also require an antitrust law.

Comrades! The basic regulator in the union economy and in the enterprise economy should, naturally, be the market, and for this we must first of all establish the market infrastructure and a network of commercial supply and marketing organizations. The question of the enterprise is inseparably linked to the work of the ministries. There is a proposal by a group of Moscow deputies concerning their further functioning. While they may not be indisputable, in my view, they are basically correct, all the more as at present we do not have at hand and do not see any alternative proposal from the USSR Council of Ministers. We have Moscow proposals, Estonian ones, but we simply do not know what the government is proposing. Possibly they have a better idea.

Comrades, I am concerned by the fact that the existing ministries, in my view, have prematurely moved away from the questions of supply, referring to the direct ties and wholesale trade. But wholesale trade has still gotten nowhere, and there is no order in the direct ties and, in my view, this cannot be instilled in a day. A recent decree of the Gosplan [State Planning Committee], the Gossnab [State Committee for Supply], and Gosarbitrazh [State Arbitration Committee] has permitted suppliers to keep the delivery volumes on last year's level. This is the truest stagnation.

How can we proceed, what can we do with the new articles which do not go through centralized distribution? For this reason, until wholesale trade is a reality, the organization of material and technical supply for the enterprise should be the most important function of the center.

Here mention has already been made that democracy can exist with a respect of the citizens for the law and for discipline. I feel that this is particularly pertinent in the economy and in production. If we do not master this, there will be new Chernobyls, new Nakhimovs.

Moreover, while Comrade Deputy Zaslavskiy has not enrolled me in the "Black Hundred," I will endeavor to be tactful. Strikes today have become a reality. So let the comrades who resolve their problems with the aid of strikes realize that they are bringing a heap of inconveniences for the comrades who want to work at this time but cannot because of the interruption in deliveries; they lose wages and must then work in the evenings and on Sundays. (Applause).

About certain problems in Bashkiria and cost accounting for an autonomous republic. Far from all the social problems have been resolved in our republic. Although recently more housing has been going up, the production of consumer goods is increasing and more food is being produced. For example, republic meat production has annually increased in recent years by 9 percent. But this is far from sufficient and this has led to definite social tension. We feel that with the changeover to real cost accounting, Bashkiria with its strong industrial and agricultural potential would be able to rectify this situation. Without going into the essence of the published plan for restructuring of the republic economy and on which we previously have submitted our comments and proposals to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers, let me say that

for realizing real cost accounting we must have amendments of the USSR Constitution in those areas where the status of the autonomous republics is determined. We agree with the political status. As for the economy, we feel that the Constitution should provide a provision according to which the republic should be the real master on its territory. At present, Article 83 states that the republic carries out the decisions of the USSR and union republic state bodies. This is clearly a provision from the period of stagnation which obliges us to carry out the decisions of the apparatus. In the same article an autonomous republic coordinates and monitors the activities of the union and republic enterprises and organizations. In what manner?

I personally understand the position of the enterprise leaders who are supervised and coordinated both by the ministers and by local authorities. For me it is not a question of whom they should obey now, as the one with the resources does the managing. And at present, the ministries have the resources. Article 82 states that a republic, "outside the limits" of the laws of the USSR and the union republics, independently resolve questions related to its running. But in practice this "outside the limits" leaves nothing for the republic. In Bashkiria, 97 percent is made up of the industry of the union and union-republic levels. We would propose that there be a constitutional provision that the republic be responsible for satisfying its social, material and spiritual needs.

For relieving the center of managing the same economy which is to be turned over to be run by the union and autonomous republics, the congress should, in my view, adopt four fundamental laws: a Law on the Enterprise (this has already been mentioned), a Law on Local Self-Management, and a Law on Land Tenure—these laws determine the possibilities of republic cost accounting and as a whole will make it possible to adopt a fourth, corresponding law. As the basis they might adopt the Law on Cost Accounting in Estonia. For us the political status may be different, but the economic status should be equal. We have a population of 4 million and a product volume of 15 billion.

Comrades! I would also like to take up the questions of ecology. Ufa started up a series of ecological demonstrations and meetings, and these were subsequently held in other regions of the nation. Since in accord with Point 7 of Article 113 of the Constitution, the Supreme Soviet provides legislation for protecting the environment and the use of natural resources, I propose working out and adopting a law on conservation and utilization of nature which would make it possible on a comprehensive basis to resolve the questions of ecology in the nation, and I also propose that the Goskompriroda [State Committee for Protection of Nature] provide a preliminary organization responsible solely to the Supreme Soviet. (Applause).

Comrades! I would like to take up one more question and conclude here. There have been speeches on interethnic questions. This question concerns not only the union republics but also the autonomous republics. We have good relations. For example, in Tataria we are now holding a 10-day festival for the literature and art of Bashkiria. But at the same time, there are also problems. I propose that we devote a special congress of people's deputies to interethnic questions after the CPSU Central Committee Plenum has been held on these same questions. Lastly, I would like to make one request. May I have a minute? Thank you, everyone.

B.Ye. Paton: Respected comrade deputies! Let me remind you that yesterday the 10-minute rule was relaxed. In an extreme case up to 15 minutes. At present, as a rule, all the speeches exceed the rule. Please adhere to the rules. The floor is now turned over....

From the audience: We cannot hear.

B.Ye. Paton: The floor is turned over to the Deputy Vasiliy Ivanovich Belov. Deputy Stoumova will speak after.

V.I. Belov, writer, secretary of the Board of the RSFSR Writers' Union (from the CPSU): I would like to begin my comments by saying that I do not understand and do not accept yesterday's two or three rude attacks on the newly elected president (applause). Even the Americans, a noisy people, do not demand impeachment on the second day after electing the president. They respect their president. (Applause).

Generally, I wonder, are we really the people's deputies? If we are truly the people's, then to what degree? I understand the nobility of Deputy Kazannik. I also recall the spirit of the two Leningrad deputies who offered to give up their candidacies in favor of another republic. But if I were in the place of the Leningrad voters, I would not vote for such deputies who abandon their rights with such ease. (Applause). We are obliged to carry out the will of our voters. Even the time of the deputy is now becoming the property of the people, and for this reason we must be aware of the hierarchy of values.

In political fighting there are the most diverse procedures. One of them is very simple and reliable, and this is the method of filling in time. For example, for entire days it is possible to discuss a procedural question or some secondary and simply unnecessary law. We can be very easily provoked into a drawn-out, fatiguing discussion of some completely haphazard issue, and then we merely waste our energy.

The orders of the voters are clearly and precisely expressed in the thousands of letters from readers and telegrams of voters. They dictate to me the hierarchy of my deputy values. In my view, it is essential to immediately work out and clarify the Basic Law. Here, in the first place, it is particularly important to bring about a further improvement in the electoral system; second, to establish broadened rights for the soviets by decentralizing power; and third—and this is the most important in my view—our Constitution should stipulate that along

with collective farm [kolkhoz]-state farm [sovkhoz] ownership of land, there should finally appear and exist private ownership with the right to inherit. I am convinced that we can and must resolve this at the current congress.

A law which along with kolkhoz ownership also permits private, farmstead and private farmer ownership of the land is essential for all the peoples inhabiting our great state. The adoption of such a law would be proof that we are seriously concerned with the future. It is not merely a matter that we are fed up with begging grain from other states. It is a fact that a new law on land tenure would to a significant degree smooth out many of the economic and particularly the nationality contradictions. It would also contribute to an ecological improvement and, in addition, to the linguistic and cultural rebirth of all the peoples of our multinational state.

I propose calling the Food Commission the Commission on Land Tenure. Certainly I am not a supporter of those hotheads who propose completely eliminating kolkhoz and sovkhoz ownership of the land. The fact that many of our kolkhozes have been plundered and devastated by the state is still not grounds for their immediate liquidation. (Applause). On the contrary, we must halt this plundering and eliminate not the kolkhozes themselves but rather Murakhovskiy's department [State Agro-Industrial Committee]. (Applause).

Land and water should be disposed of not by the department but rather by the people in the form of their local soviets, with the aid of the all-union laws. The USSR Minvodkhoz [Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources], which over the last 20 years has spent some 150 billion of the people's rubles and destroyed millions of hectares of the best land, has brought agriculture to the brink of disaster. It was the ministry, together with the hydroproject builders and chemists which plundered a great river, on the banks of which scores of different peoples lived for centuries! I mean the Volga.

The course of destroying the economy with the aid of departmental decisions is continuing. Recently Murakhovskiy forwarded to the Politburo a note proposing that by the year 2005 the area of irrigated land be increased to 40 million hectares. For these destructive purposes, the Minvodkhoz has again requested some 230 billion rubles from us. We must not give them! (Applause). With this money we could build 500,000 km of roads, 10 million full-amenity rural homes, hundreds of thousands of schools, hospitals and stores. With these billions we could keep the personnel in the countryside and effectively eliminate the food crisis. But for some reason we do not want to recognize our mistakes.

The Minvodkhoz, which recently made a fool of itself in 1988, received thousands of excavators and bulldozers. At the same time, several hundred units of this equipment planned for the Program "Roads of the Non-Chernozem Zone" were not received by the RSFSR Minavtodor [Ministry of Highways]. Generally speaking, it would be a good thing to speak about the political, economic and financial equality of the Soviet Union republics. The unequal political status of the RSFSR in the union of our republics is becoming, in the view of experts, a source of russophobia. Since the RSFSR lacks such important bodies as a central committee, many state committees, and an academy of sciences, it is assumed that these functions are supposedly carried out by the all-union bodies. Is is not for this reason that the all-union bodies are perceived as Russian bodies? Their mistakes and failings, all the flaws of our system in which all our peoples live, are perceived as the errors of the Russians. The inequality of the republics is also felt in the forming of the all-union budget, and in the policy of procurement prices, subsidies and distributed funds. The long years of inequality are confirmed by the demographic situation. It, this situation, is bad not only in the RSFSR, the Ukraine and Belorussia, but also in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. However, the economic inequality is particularly characteristic of Siberia and the so-called Non-Chernozem Zone. A majority of the deputies from our congress simply do not know the depressing statistical data on this question. In order to avoid an emotional outburst, I will not read the figures. I will merely give one: Before the revolution, the Russians and Ukrainians had the highest increment in the population. Now both are confronted with the threat of depopulation. In the nation they continue to vote with their feet. I do not envy the governments of the three Baltic republics, where the increase in population is occurring due to immigrants and not from an increased birthrate of the indigenous population. Is this normal? I profoundly believe that the deputies of the Transcaucasus, the Central Asian republics, and the Baltic, as well as the deputies from the autonomous Russian republics, will correctly understand this part of my speech. But I am in no way confident that the so-called "democratic minority," actually the press, will not stick some label on me. At one time, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, in six languages, called me a "misanthrope." Of course, the abuse does not stick. If certain members of the Politburo and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev himself have learned to tolerate badmouthing, then we, mere mortals, have nothing to complain of. But I am still greatly concerned by the fact that the mass information media, particularly television, are in certain hands, and often reflect the interests not of all the people but rather the interests of certain, capital groups. (Applause). Here pluralism as yet has not even found its ground. Judging from the speeches, the Moscow group relies largely on science. In actuality, in no other nation is there such a number of academicians as in ours. In Moscow, academicians are a dime a dozen, space and all sorts. But why in my village does the peasant still mow hay in the same method as he did in the 12th century? (Applause). And what is the result of modern economic science? The result, in my opinion, is still just one. This is the Riga Market in Moscow. Over the 4 years of restructuring, the Moscow and other economists have not thought up anything except urban cooperatives, which should start not in the

city but in the countryside. (Applause). And how can we respect such a science which gave us Chernobyl? I am in no way against science as such, but we must not think merely about our academy interests. A majority of the intelligentsia lives in cities. In my home kolkhoz, for 15 years now, the school has not taught a foreign language, as there is no instructor. And can a village graduate gain admission to a university or institute, if the school does not even teach a required subject? Just around 8 percent of the total number of students is peasant children. And we should not forget that the world is governed by literate people....

Here they have mentioned the danger of hooliganism and extremism for our young democracy. And who is to blame, you might ask? Certainly it is not us, certainly it is not television, not the pop tour and not the movies which propagandize the cult of cruelty and violence? (Applause).

The centralizing of cultural policy and turning it over for complete control to the same, free-and-easy people does not produce anything good. Let me read an excerpt from a telegram: "We request that you tell the congress not to allow the vulgarization of culture. The commercial movie, pop music, pornography, the vanguard, alcohol, and drugs destroy the hope of rebirth." Incidentally, about alcoholics. The nonfulfillment of the 1985 law caused disappointment in the people in the actions of the Politburo. It was not a bad law. But the law came and went. Let me read one more telegram, actually an excerpt from the Urals. A woman writes: "I myself have divorced my husband because of his drunkenness. Alone she raised her son, kept a cow, two calves and a sheep. I worked the entire war at a factory while raising my son and for 5 years have been a nurse. Now I am barely able to keep the farm. I deliver milk to the state with a fat content of 4.1. On election day the leadership sent a bus with a voting urn and in the bus everyone was given a drink—just vote. And this is what holds the people together. There are two peasants in the village and they are too drunk to make sense." Now I turn to the Politburo members. You, probably, like all of us, go during the break to the buffet. There they sell fine fermented milk, but, if this woman were to go on a drinking binge, I don't know what would remain in the Kremlin buffet. (Applause). It is time for us to understand the simple truth that a sober economy is impossible with a drunken budget. Those who now complain of the severe budget deficit, we might ask: And why did this happen? Might it not be because the nation has 18 million managers? What does the support of such personnel cost? And what about the war in Afghanistan? And Cuba, Nicaragua and Ethiopia? And what about space? How much do our great festivals, olympiads and international forums cost? How much do those canals of the Minvodkhoz cost? Small wonder that there is a budget deficit with such ministers as Vasilyev and Murakhovskiy. They have squandered billions and things seem no better for the immediate future. (Applause).

I am forced to quote an excerpt from one other letter to me and Valentin Grigoryevich Rasputin. "We request that you come forward with a legislative initiative on having the Supreme Soviet cancel all deals involving the leasing of parts of Soviet territory to foreign and mixed firms. There must be the prohibiting of similar deals in the future as well as the canceling of all other concessions and leases. At present, there seems to be some sort of mercenary frenzy. Some are ready to sell themselves lock, stock and barrel, and here even spit on their motherland. It is bad enough that there has been trade in living articles (athletes numbered like at beauty contests). It is bad enough that the domestic do-gooders are ready to clear out all the riches of the nation for dollars. It is bad enough that the Soviet Union is being turned into a dumping ground for radioactive waste and hazardous products, and now it has come down to bartering away the territories of our own land." (Applause).

I continue quoting: "Just what is this—an extreme degree of political feeble-mindedness, an extreme degree of irresponsibility, a concealed hate for one's country, or a cynical sell-out? Having learned to take bribes in rubles, are they now going for dollars? We are not setting things aside for our motherland. Here it is for our children, our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren to live. This is their land. With what authority does the gorispolkom [city executive committee] or oblispolkom [oblast executive committee], with what authority do these people command our national wealth? Such questions should be settled only by the Supreme Soviet or the Congress of People's Deputies. The shameful deals should be cancelled. The shameful deals to turn our nation into a dumping ground for radioactive wastes should also be publicized and cancelled.

It is hard not to agree with these authors, but I would add here the demand to publish and discuss the conditions of all international treaties and publish the details. Why are these conditions accepted and signed by a narrow group of persons? I propose to the congress and the congress Presidium that we submit to voting by the congress the question of the immediate preparing and holding of a referendum on nuclear energy. (Applause).

Respected deputies! From the congress rostrum several times we have heard proud, even exulting voices about power. Supposedly from now on power forever rests with the people's deputies. But I do not share such deputy optimism. Don't hurry up to hurry, as they say in Odessa! We still do not have power; it belongs to others, sometimes to persons not even known to us. It is in the hands, it is in those hands, in the hands of those who have the television cameras and newspaper editors. It belongs to those who sit closer to the rostrum and those who have already learned to use a Xerox machine. Even here, at the congress, power belongs precisely to such people. There are people who dream about all sorts of disorder, they dream about chaos. Do not forget this, please. It is essential to live and work with ever-growing responsibility.

Thank you for patiently hearing me out. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: The floor is turned over to Deputy Galina Ivanovna Stoumova.

G.I. Stoumova, shop chief of the Gatchinskiy Voskhoz, Gatchinskiy Rayon (Gatchina Territorial Electoral District, Leningrad Oblast): Comrade deputies! Since I am an agricultural worker and have been employed in this sector for 30 years, I would like to devote my speech largely to this question. But, having listened to the speech of Vasiliy Aleksandrovich Starodubtsev and the appeal which I also signed, in order not to repeat myself, I will take up only such questions as aid to the rural inhabitants, in particular in Leningrad Oblast, since certain regions of our nation are not having difficulties here and I will also mention several demands of my voters.

Over scores of years, around large cities they have established zones raising vegetables and potatoes. The city has always helped the countryside since we are able to harvest only one-quarter of the area with our own forces. I understand what harm the state suffers when machines at plants and factories stand idle. But since we move people from the countryside to the city, since there exists a great inequality in the social sphere between city and countryside, and as long as the village is not provided with highly productive equipment, we are forced to turn to the city for help. But under conditions of the covering of costs and self-financing, the question related to help from the city has changed sharply and not in favor of the countryside. It is bad enough that the sponsors do not come and for those who are sent to the kolkhozes and sovkhozes the sponsors require 50 or 60 rubles for each man day. The students have come out with the slogan "an academic year without agricultural work"; school children can come to the sovkhoz only on a volunteer basis. But we know the "volunteer ideas" of the children and their parents and for this reason it is difficult to expect their aid for the sovkhozes. I want to ask whether the members of the Politburo and the Council of Ministers are aware that last year in Leningrad Oblast because of the manpower shortage a portion of the fields was plowed under together with unharvested cabbage and carrots, dill, sorrel and lettuce. And no one was held responsible for this. How can one punish the farm leader if it is impossible to embrace and unembraceable?

This year we expect a repetition of last year's situation. We have already overtaxed our people with heavy manual physical labor. But each sovkhoz worker, be they milkmaid, pig tender, specialist or director, in addition to the main job, and this is often done without days off, by a decision of the labor collective council, has been given the duty of weeding five-hundredths [of area] of root crops, loading hay in the barn, and in the autumn harvesting cabbage. There is a way to eliminate these negative phenomena in the future. In Leningrad Oblast in one agrarian combine there is highly productive equipment from France and the Netherlands. City industry has already manufactured examples of this equipment. Now there must be help from the Council of Ministers in serially producing this equipment so that the individual regions do not produce it by artisan, expensive methods. For now such equipment does not exist and I appeal to the workers of industrial enterprises in large cities—I feel that the Moscow sovkhozes also have a need for this—to provide us with help. And I also turn to the USSR Council of Ministers so that a decree be passed to allocate funds from the state budget to compensate for the expenditures on bringing in the crop, as was the case last year. But it must be considered that planting this year was done 3 weeks earlier than last year.

I am somewhat repeating myself, but I cannot help but mention women. Article 35 of the Constitution proclaims the equality of men and women. We, the women, are in favor of equal rights but we are against the equal right to heavy physical labor, to equal leave time, and to the same length of the work day. Finally, we must provide an opportunity for a woman to be concerned with what is predetermined for her by nature herself, that is, the raising of children and maternity. (Applause). For this reason I feel that there is a great need to extend the leave for taking care of an infant up to 3 years. I will not repeat myself and speak about the fate of our war and labor veterans and pensioners. Much has been said at this congress about these people, particularly the kolkhoz pensioners, and I will mention only the instructions about them to the congress. Here are the instructions.

To review the questions of lifting the restrictions on wages and pensions as now the ceiling is R300. Certain pensioners could still continue to work, in particular, on kolkhozes, particularly as we are experiencing such a shortage of experienced personnel. They still could be working but because of the wage restriction they do not go to work. Secondly, the length of employment on a kolkhoz should be considered in the total length of labor employment in figuring a pension. It is very painful to watch a person who has worked 36 years, including 29 years on a kolkhoz and 9 on a sovkhoz, and who will receive a pension for only the 9 years of labor employment. Thirdly, female construction workers who are employed in finishing work involving the use of paints and varnishes have strongly urged that we state at the congress that these harmful conditions must be considered and with 15 years experience in this work provide the right to retire on a pension at age 50.

Several words about the housing program in the countryside. It is essential that the city face the problem of rural construction, but now everything is turned backwards. Construction committees have been set up and they, in particular in our Leningrad, we feel will carry out basic construction only in the city. Why? I will tell you. Under the program, by 1990, just in our Gachinskiy Rayon, we plan to build 90,000 m^2 of housing. As of now we have succeeded in "pushing out" only 12,000 m^2. For this reason it is hard to say how the housing program will be carried out in the countryside.

There is one other instruction. We must prevent the departments from carrying out their ideas on the territory of the soviets, prevent their fleecing, and provide the soviets with an opportunity to control their own budget with a focus on improving the social sphere. I thank you for your attention. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: Comrade deputies, a 30-minute break is hereby declared.

B.Ye. Paton: Comrade deputies, let us continue our work. The floor is now given to Deputy Larionov. The next to speak will be Deputy Chernichenko.

V.P. Larionov, deputy chairman of the Presidium of the Yakutsk Scientific Center under the Siberian Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of the Institute for Physical-Technical Problems of the North (from the CPSU): Deeply respected chairman of the nation's Supreme Soviet! Deeply respected chairman of the session! Dear comrade people's deputies! The deputies of the Yakut Autonomous Republic have difficulties similar to those of the Bashkir delegation. All the people's deputies representing the Yakut Republic at the congress would like to speak from this rostrum and undoubtedly each has something to say. But our northern tactfulness does not permit us to elbow our way to the rostrum although many of our comrades would actually like to speak and voice their position.

I feel that our deputies will be given an opportunity to state their positions on the Supreme Soviet Commissions and the committees of people's deputies, by participating in working out the congress documents as well as through the mass information media.

I would like to take up certain questions of improving our state structure, the harmonizing of nationality relations and developing a regional economy. In the process of preparing our nation's new Constitution which, it seems, should be adopted by our sitting of USSR people's deputies, very complex questions arise concerning the structure of our nationality-state and territorial formations. The existing structure which was adopted in organizing our union was justified at a certain historical stage in building a socialist state. However, at the present stage of our development, when priority has been given to common human values and the necessity of establishing a state under the law, in terms of our fundamental basis for the status of the union and autonomous republics, the autonomous oblasts and autonomous districts, there are questions requiring a clear answer. It would be better to ask them now when we intend to begin creating a new Constitution for the nation.

I, for example (although a different opinion has also been voiced from this rostrum), find it completely incomprehensible why Tataria has a lower level of statehood than, for instance, the highly esteemed republic of ancient culture, Armenia. Why do the 4 million of Bashkiria hold such a lower status, in comparison, for example, with Estonia? Here the basic distinguishing feature is the presence of frontiers with foreign countries and for me, for example, this is far from persuasive. Certainly in essence we have laid down the bases not for separation but rather unification of our peoples on equal grounds. In terms of such peoples and ethnic groups as the Evens, Yukagirs, Nivkhi, Nanytsy and many others, our state system virtually does not consider their presence.

The problem of the harmonious unity of our multinational state, it seems to me, has not been settled on the principles of the currently existing structure of nationality-state and territorial formations. The questions related to the state organization of the nationality-territorial formations require a profound study and extensive discussion of thoughtful and balanced decisions. For precisely this reason an immediate task for the Commission on Interethnic Relations of the Soviet of Nationalities under the USSR Supreme Soviet is the working out of draft laws for the extensive discussion in the nation of the questions of reshaping the structure of the nationality-state and territorial formations.

Now on the question of improving the electoral system. It seems to me that here we must have a formula which would provide guarantees for the representation of all the country's nations and nationalities in the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. This is fundamentally important in terms of the ethnoses which do not have nationality-administrative formations. The legal powers of the northern nationalities could be realized through their social association which could be established within the framework of the reform of the political system as well as through the Committee of the Council of Nationalities on Northern and Arctic Peoples.

The fact that representatives of just 69 nations and nationalities were proposed in the first stage as candidate USSR people's deputies and even fewer were elected and are present in this auditorium (there are representatives of 65 nationalities) shows the seriousness of this problem. It would be worth recalling that according to the 1926 census, 194 nations, nationalities and ethnic groups were recorded, and later by the method of simple unification over 100 nationalities were recognized as living in our nation.

In the sphere of nationality relations, the economic aspect holds an important place. Even before the adoption of the new legislation on the Principles of Nationality-State Formations, even now we must determine the economic rights and duties of the union and autonomous republics, including in the area of foreign economic ties, and we must clearly define the basic principles for economic and financial relations of the central and regional organizations. The dictating of terms by the all-union ministries, which is presently generally recognized and which widely follows its own enforceable enactments discrediting laws [as published], depersonify the local authorities and are a factor in impeding regional development.

On this level the problem of the development of the north requires particular attention. It must be admitted that the Soviet north in demographic terms is overburdened, and ecologically is little protected. The intensive industrial development of the northern regions has been accompanied by an irreversible destruction of the ecosystem with its growing immunodeficiency.

The unsound exploitation of natural resources by the extracting industry ends up with a dead lunar landscape and thousands of square kilometers of flooded, felled and fire-devastated taiga. Around the industrial centers of Yakutia on a territory with an area of 2,400 km^2, there has been a sharp decline in the hunting and fishing stocks, and reindeer raising has virtually disappeared here.

In a number of instances, a threat has arisen for the survival of the ethnic groups. For this reason it is essential to work out a scientific and humane concept for the development of the north, and give up assigning the north the role of just a raw material fief.

In planning the socioeconomic development of the northern regions, it is essential to consider the demographic factors as an important element in the policy and on the nationality question. For example, in the economy of the Yakut Republic the ore-mining industry prevails, and this sector has developed traditionally employing extensive methods. The republic is a supplier of raw material resources, and this from the very start has determined the unprofitability of its economy, primarily as a consequence of the existing price policy for raw materials. This is a public fact. Here, in terms of the level of social amenities and in terms of the condition of schools, hospitals and clubs and, in particular, in rural localities where basically the indigenous population lives, the republic holds one of the last places in the RSFSR. There are many reasons for this. One of them is the high migration of the population. Over the last 20 years, according to estimates of the statistical services, more than 1 million persons have moved into Yakutia and up to 1 million persons have moved out. At present, the entire republic population is a little more than a million persons.

An unique phenomenon has been established of a provisionality with a low production return per worker unit. The economic outlays of the uncontrolled moving in of migrants into new industrial development regions are enormous, while the moral ones are merely hard to comprehend, particularly in the sphere of interethnic relations. For overcoming the migration processes and stabilizing the population, for example in the Yakut Republic, it is essential to have fundamental development for the sectors of raw materials processing, to achieve the instituting of just prices for the delivery of the products of the extracting sectors as well as the sectors of the traditional economy, and to completely solve the problems of the social and domestic spheres and pension support considering the harsh natural and climatic conditions of the habitat. These questions are characteristic for all the northern regions of the nation.

The Yakut ASSR is part of the Far Eastern Economic Region. Our economic region provides the nation with 96 percent of the mined diamonds, the basic portion of gold, tin, polymetals, antimony, gas, and oil mined in our nation. The fur, lumber and fishing sectors of industry have developed. At the same time, the narrow raw-material focus of the economy in the Yakut Republic has predetermined the growth rate of the industrial complex, which is out of balance with the development of the social sphere, and the excessive burden of the mineral and raw material complex on the natural environment with the absence of resource-saving ecologically clean production methods.

For this reason, resting on us, the people's deputies, is a responsibility on the matter of working out the legal, legislative and economic bases and a new socioeconomic policy for developing the northern territories. This includes in the area of an active and effective social policy aimed at providing a full range of vital conditions for man, satisfying his material and spiritual values, and protecting the health of the population in compensating for the negative consequences of the climatic factors, the remoteness and undevelopment of the territory.

Here, achieving the real sovereignty of the nationality-territorial formations on the basis of their economic independence and effective mechanisms for controlling the demographic situation; active participation in economic integration, in foreign economic and overseas cultural ties; the elaboration of legal enactments which protect the priority interests of the indigenous population in the industrial development of the territories of their traditional habitat—these and other areas should be a matter of activity for the appropriate commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Congress of People's Deputies.

A most important, vitally important Law Governing Local Self-Government and the Local Economy, by which we plan to set off on the real path of exercising power by the local soviets as a whole for the nation, should consider the level and character of development of the productive forces in a specific economic region, and the specific conditions of management and human activity. In the area of price formation, the prime difficulty for our republic is the economically unsound, understated prices for fuel and energy resources and for precious metals. Here the republic receives nothing from the profits of selling the end manufactured product, and the very rich region is constantly playing the role of a beggar. The violating of the price parity between industry and agriculture, the growing gap between the level of state, cooperative, market, and speculative prices for agricultural products undermine the bases for realizing real cost accounting in the complex agro-industrial system of the North, under the harsh natural climatic

conditions. The realization of regional cost accounting which would provide for the economic independence of the republic and territories would serve as a basis for strengthening the self-awareness and dignity of the people, morality in society, and for raising discipline and efficiency of labor, which at present we clearly lack.

At the same time, I agree with those speeches by deputies who caution us against the centrifugal trends arising around the "prosperity of nationality apartments." These trends at times contradict the interests of economic integration and political consolidation of our entire society.

Comrades! I feel that everyone realizes the necessity of strengthening the role of science in adopting crucial decisions on the statewide and regional level. The organization of the Siberian Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences in 1957, and later the Urals and Far Eastern Regional departments of the USSR Academy of Sciences, created the essential prerequisite for raising the intellectual potential of the regions. At the same time, I agree with Deputy Kazarezov that the excessive centralization of science does not increase its effectiveness.

In line with the wide-scale industrial development with the eastern and northern regions, it is essential to undertake new fundamental steps to strengthen the scientific centers of these regions. It is essential to propose new organizational and economic mechanisms in the aim of strengthening the scientific approach in solving complex national economic tasks in the north, and confirm the primacy of solving ecological questions over the economic one.

Each region of the nation has its own priority problems. In our republic the crucial condition for life support is transport, the crux of all economic and social policy. With each passing year the problems which depend completely upon the delivery of national economic freight grow worse. And at present these needs are only 60-70 percent satisfied, and this seriously impedes the achieving of a rhythmical life for the entire republic. Moreover, the seasonal nature of freight shipments carried out chiefly by river and maritime routes leads to the stockpiling and, consequently, to the freezing of a large amount of valuable materials en route and at the transshipping depots.

In light of this, the construction of the Amur-Yakut Mainline [AYaM] has assumed exceptionally important significance for the further socioeconomic development of our republic. The necessity and effectiveness of building the AYaM is shown by the experience of operating the first sector of the meridional railroad called the Little BAM. In a situation where, unfortunately, our main BAM has in fact still not gone into operation, the Little BAM from Tynda to Berkakit—Neryungra, according to the data of the Yakut Scientific Center—has already paid for itself and each provides a profit for the nation. At present, the realization of the AYaM Project (the first stage to the town of Tommot) is threatened due to the shortage of financing for the work being done here. We realize the importance and acute need for saving money, but for all considerations, even the most justified, this cannot be achieved at the expense of curtailing work on the AYaM. In light of the completely valid idea in the report of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, it must be emphasized that the AYaM construction capacity which has already been established exceeds the amount of capital investments allocated up to now, and could significantly accelerate the construction of this important project.

In all the stages of our socialist construction, we have worked under the slogan "Everything for the Sake of Man!" However, the deformations of our socialist principles often brought us the reverse results. To find the real ways for overcoming this, in my view, is the main duty of the corps of people's deputies. And it is important to find these paths in the brief interval of time allocated to us. Any delay costs the nation too dearly. And the more we delay the more we must pay. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: The floor is given over to Deputy Chernichenko. Deputy Kalish will speak next.

Yu.D. Chernichenko, commentator of the Agriculture Section of Central Television (Gagarinskiy Territorial Electoral District, Moscow): I was born in a place where even in the 1960's you could hear a grandmother comforting her grandchild: "Dear, the Muscovite is coming, the Muscovite is coming." There was no underlying national slur here. The good woman merely wanted to frighten her disobedient child. But when the pre-congress period began, and after the euphoria of the elections—there were 12 people for each place—we got into a squeeze, into a situation of dictated lists and unannounced programs, when there was a real struggle of power for power seemingly honestly and openly chosen by the people, and then there arose the image of the "Muscovite," the bug-bear, the troublemaker from the capital. He set off to capture the rather zealous minds which were predisposed for this. The poorhouse of political education on Trubnaya Square—and in 5 weeks it in fact became a house of political education! There people assembled who were known throughout the nation. And during the night they forged, so to speak, inadmissible things—the general concept and program of this congress!

It makes no sense to involve the leadership (we must live together) but I should secretly report that sitting in with us were both Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov, the first Moscow secretary, and even Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov.

What we hatched up, put together, what seems such a danger for us, was duplicated and sent out to the deputies at a meeting of the RSFSR delegation, not without serious resistance. Who, it might be asked, allowed you?

The story of the Moscow group is fear of a real political initiative. And the initiative evoked a counterinitiative of punishment. Having sensitively picked up the half-voice command, some proposed that the professor be reforged in a shop—a purely Mao Zedong strategem—a second brought up the question of the deficit, while a third point out "this is where all the trouble about leasing and cooperatives comes from!" A charming female deputy from Kazakhstan even deprived them of her female disposition.

Obedient indignation, let us recall, quite recently belittled Pasternak, slandered Tvardovskiy, and hounded Sakharov with "crucify him." But older people, somewhat more experienced than the difficult female delegate, should have a sympathy for the academician or writer who swears constantly when he has given way to weakness and signed a base document. But there is nothing to be done; you cannot shake this in the people's memory or in history. And as a result—on the Supreme Soviet—for one reason or another we lack the economists Abalkin, Bogmolov, Shelev, Tikhonov, Petrakhov, and Popov, and, naturally, the sociologist Zaslavskaya and the historian Afanasyev are not to be found there. There are virtually no lawyers. There is not a single public affairs writer—I ask you to consider—who is widely read by the nation! What is this, an outburst of the Cultural Revolution? Or "the Moor has done his duty, let him go?" Only please, don't talk to me about rotation. Everyone realizes that here there is no random chance, and the old kolkhoz saying is correct: "The machine does not go itself but the tractor operator drives the machine." (Applause).

The new wine of selective enthusiasm has been poured into the old wineskins of the party dictatorship, and this is the heart of the problem. I am an old Communist; I have been a member for around 40 years. In translation "party" means a "part." And when the part becomes bigger than the whole, the need arises of danger and conspiracy. Elections were never communist things. The people clearly separated the party and the bureaucratic ruling apparatus. But during the pre-congress time, the apparatus silently took revenge and began to approve at the Central Committee plenum even the leaders of the parliamentary commissions, giving rise to disobedience of the most pliable, and reading lists which none of the officials had drawn up. The anonymity of initiative, the behind-the-scenes deals—what an anachronism! How this was savored by the vengeful orators of the April plenum who considered themselves the first, but in the elections emerged last.

If the millions of those who have awakened to political life reject the okrug meetings as the initial step of bureaucracy, then they will never approve the final filters, the practice of the broken firing pin, the method of stipulating "as a rule" and "as an exception," whereby the problems are dissipated to the winds. "Divide and rule!" does not work anymore. If you want to rule productively, then combine and achieve the goal! (Applause).

But it is not I who says this. "You elected us? For what? In order for us to argue, reason and decide. But if in all disputes one sees deviations, then it would be better to use dolls or dummies. But who then would think for these dummies?" These are the words of Aleksey Ivanovich Rykov, the first chairman of the Council of People's Commissars after Lenin! (Applause).

Restructuring has proven itself. We have survived. If according to the count of Lenin's NEP [New Economic Policy] of 1921, then we are already living in 1925, and by this time the nation was fed, shod, and the People's Commissar Kraski had not been able to export the Russian grain for gold. "Tell Gorbachev to feed the people!" exclaims one very zealous admirer of restructuring over there, on the other side of the cordon. He clearly has tsarist views, and he feels, like many of us, that this can be done by one man. We, thank heavens, have concluded that "no one will provide us with deliverance—neither God, tsar nor hero." And a coercive agricultural system will never feed the people!

We have spent a good deal on our approach to the truth, and this is quite natural. We cannot blame either nature, which in our regions has created all the natural and climatic zones of the world, nor our unfortunate soil, which contains almost 190 million hectares of Chernozem, an adornment of our planet. There is only one guilty party: the causes of human poverty and the dying of our arable land, and these are exclusively political factors. (Applause).

Stalinism in agriculture is an economic vendee. It is not merely capable of torpedoing restructuring, but is already doing this. We must not exploit the word "plan." A plan which is methodically not carried out, which somehow drags along by completely unacceptable confiscations from another sector, or from hidden blood-sucking, so to speak, by exchanging our oil for the grain of others—this is not a plan. This is something else, and we must find a word for it, then provide it with the word "Gos" or something "Gosplan."

No matter how you try, you would never be able to explain to an intelligent person an economy which produces on a per capita basis 5-fold more tractors and 10-fold more combines than the United States, but produces almost 2-fold less grain. But that is only half of the problem. It produces 3 times as many shoes (it would be better if it did not produce them!) than the United States. But there are other things. For example, sugar. Thank goodness my grandson has learned to take his ration card and go stand in line for sugar. We have 31 kg of it on a per capita basis, while the United States has 22 and there is no line and no ration coupons (now there are coupons in Moscow). But in comparison with industry, we produce 6 times more ore than the United States but 6-fold less modern synthetic resins and plastics than the U.S. Why such an industry?

Or for electronics. Present here is the respected, and our top counter, Comrade Osipyan. I learned with terror that he—a leading electronics expert and a great specialist in physics—used an abacus for calculating. This, I feel, will go down in history. (Applause). Yes, the system which seemed arrested in 1926 by the ruble and by the commanding but not responsible apparatus has led to national humiliation. Let us not be the children who think that Buratino, a wooden puppet, their favorite, moves by himself. Behind him stands the puppeteer. We have literally agreed (because this is the 7th day we are meeting and there has not been a single word about the complete dictatorship of the party apparatus) that not a single hair will fall from the cow without the approval or command of the Central Committee Agriculture Department!

We do not accept this although we beat upon Murakhovskiy. I must admit I am a defender of Murakhovskiy. At 168 electoral and writer meetings I said that Comrade Murakhovskiy is not guilty of anything. Over the door of his office you could write as in an American saloon: "Please don't shoot the pianist, he is playing the best he knows how." Because up to 8 deputies and ministers are sitting in the office and reception room of the deputy head of the Central Committee department. Everyone knows this but this need not be said. In a well-brought up society, this is considered impolite.

I am a great fan of television, and now I watch with enormous interest the television educational programs of Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev. He travels about the country, and he learns a great deal clearly because this is a new sector for him (applause) and he willingly shares it with us. I am crazy about this. Such cultural propaganda, and he is taking away the livelihood of many television journalists, and this is fine. I merely want to say, I want to ask, as I was asked 168 times, why in a politically essential sector, a sector which determines the possibility and future of restructuring, have they placed a man who understands nothing of this, and who has failed in ideology? How can this happen?! (Applause). I do not know.

I am aware that bureaucracy is supranational, and the Russian official also was the same type as the Marxist Prussian functionary and he equally esteemed the miracle, secrecy, and authority. But a concrete nation, a given society, a given association of nations can be humiliated by the bureaucracy, and very productively so. In my view, the bureaucracy humiliates it in a minimum of three ways. As for the total of nations—I do not want to become involved in these disputes because this concerns all of us.

And the first, which alas was not mentioned at this congress, is our shameful exports. We export 200 million tonnes of oil. Who has not stood by his car with an empty gas tank? Some 200 million tonnes of oil a year and predominantly crude! Are our heads being turned by the glory of the emirates? Certainly this is the squandering of our grandchildren's heritage. A true master could not do this. This is an humiliation of me before my grandson. I do not know what I will have to pass on to him.

The opposite bothers me, too. I am humiliated by our imports. The importing of what is grown on our own lands, things and materials which are completely replaceable, the importing of grain, meat and fats is extremely advantageous to the person who sells this and disruptive for the person who buys it.

Do not believe, respected audience, do not believe, deputies, that we purchase some second-rate, some unnecessary grain. Nothing of the sort! Last year according to Goskomstat [State Statistics Committee], we purchased 21 million tonnes of wheat. Name someone who could explain why these 21 million tonnes were purchased when the nation produces the same wheat and 2-fold more than it itself requires? Where is the schizophrenia, and where is the logic? And after this how can you call the Gosplan an authoritative institution? This has lasted not a year but decades. Last year I counted 25 years, a quarter-century jubilee for this antinational practice. And when I am asked: "Does Murakhovskiy believe in kolkhozes?" I say: "Between you and me, no." "Does he believe in sovkhozes?" I say: "In no manner." "Why?" Well, because he would have paid his own first, and over the 25 years everything would have been grown at home, in our nation. Because Kazan, Ryazan, the Kuban, and Kulunda would long have adjusted to these monstrous billions, and the nation of socialism would not appear as an international sponger, as it now does abroad.

Finally, the third and last stage of humiliation. This is a technical humiliation. We have become backward people everywhere, do you realize? The Estonians have the word "Russian work," and this can exist between neighbors. This "Russian work" is bad but, unfortunately, the Estonian article and the Karakalpak are also bad. Are we to blame for this? Are we genetically this way? No! The political system is to blame which can lead but without being responsible for this. At present, I simply can't keep within the time....

I participated in the agrarian note—in that extensive and, in my view, very business-like note—which was read to you yesterday by the respected agrarian deputies. This is also an example of a group and there is nothing wrong with this.

I merely request one thing in these last seconds. Don't mix up, don't tie up everything in "later—later." "Tomorrow, tomorrow and not today" are words not only of lazy persons, but also said by political masters who can make things far removed so that at present short circuits do not arise. They are not short but rather very long! We are on the edge of such dissatisfaction, the edge of such irritation! The poisons of lines and family irritations have so stuffed the national liver that we can expect the most unpleasant of things.

I am a conciliator. I want to lead people from the meeting to work, I want to divert them from conversations or from strikes. You have everything, you are rich. You have been given land. I propose along with the Moscow group that a

Land Law be adopted. Let us repeat out loud Lenin's words "from food requisitioning to a food tax," which were the most revolutionary after the words "All power to the soviets!" in the sense of national salvation and the calming of passions, in the sense of eliminating the food shortage in 2 or 3 years. Now, and not sometime later! If we at the next session, our autumn meeting, do not solemnly pass, with the singing of the national anthems, a Land Law, then we are not worth a brass farthing. There will be no more trust in us.

About the Moscow group: Let us remove the word "Moscow." We have just as many people from Chelyabinsk and Orenburg who are asking for a human dialogue, from Kamchatka and Chukotka, from Kursk and who knows where.... We, it seems, have been granted the Small Auditorium in the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. We invite everyone, including Meshalkin. It is a pity that Nina Andreyeva is not here; we would invite her with great satisfaction as an indicator of innovation. Thank you! (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: The floor is turned over to Deputy Kalish. The next to speak will be Deputy Mazurov.

V.N. Kalish, steelcaster at the A.N. Kuzmin Dneprospetsstal [Dnieper Special Steel] Electrometallurgical Plant, the Ukraine, Zaporozhye (from the CPSU): Respected deputies, it is a great honor for a worker to come up on this rostrum. I thank the Presidium for granting such an opportunity. But I find it difficult to speak from this rostrum of this first congress. A great responsibility has been placed in our hands. For this reason I immediately want to tell you, comrades: We must not divide up here into deputies who have come to the congress from the territorial or nationality districts and deputies from the social organizations.

I feel that my electors would find it unpleasant to hear if I were called such a deputy. We cannot be divided into a minority and majority. This happened outside your desire. The people expect a great deal from us and from the congress. And we do not have the right to deceive their hopes.

Of course, with the end of the congress there will be no more meat or consumer goods on the store shelves, but we must outline a realistic path for escaping from the arising crisis situation. In working out the tactics of these solutions we should employ everything reasonable that has been brought here by the "majority" as well as the offended "minority." Each of us represents a definite region of the nation with its troubles, misfortunes and problems. I, having become a deputy from the CPSU, here represent workers from Zaporozhye. A majority of us used as the basis of our pre-election program the Appeal of the CPSU Central Committee to the Party and to the Soviet People. In the pre-election meetings we promised the people to use all our deputies' powers to provide the best possible solution to the food problem, the housing problem, the problem of consumer goods production, and ecological problems.

The report of Comrade Gorbachev provided an analysis of realizing these problems on a national scale. Many speakers also made their own proposals. It is my opinion that while at present we can note shifts in housing construction, virtually no progress has been made in solving the Food Program. This also is true of the production of consumer goods, and here things are even worse. My contacts with the peasantry provide grounds for stating that the decisions of the March plenum, which everyone was expecting so eagerly, have not been borne out. People are stating directly that the people cannot be fed by leasing alone. Here I support the agrarian specialists and their appeal to the congress. The countryside must be helped, or, as the press noisily put it, we must repay our debts to the countryside. I realize that it will be difficult to find the funds in the nation required for this, but find them we must; otherwise restructuring will collapse. For 4 years we have been talking and holding meetings, but nothing has happened. My proposal is to instruct the government, beginning in 1990, to stop issuing the ferrous metallurgical enterprises a 100-percent state order, but rather draw this up within the limits of 80 percent. The remaining 20 percent and everything produced above the plan would be turned over to the needs of the countryside and, first of all, for resolving such fundamental problems as water supply and gas supply of the villages. (Applause).

Among the many problems which beset our life, one has appeared which in terms of acuteness has in a number of places entered the category of primary. This is the ecological problem. Linked to it is the appearance of various informal associations, spontaneous and organized meetings, demonstrations, and various ultimatums. This problem has arisen with particular acuteness in Zaporozhye, which is on the list of cities with an elevated level of atmospheric pollution. The question is not a new one, and it has been raised repeatedly from the rostrum of the last sitting of the Supreme Soviet. It has been raised on the pages of newspapers and magazines as well as on the Zaporozhye-Moscow telelink.

I do not want to give the number of tonnes of dust, gases and carcinogenic substances which fall on the heads of the people of Zaporozhye as well as the illnesses related to this. I will say one thing: Decisive measures are required not only by us but also by the government. We are told: Here is money for you, take it and build treatment facilities. But that is not the problem. The Zaporozhye Metallurgical Combine was built in the 1930's by the entire nation for the needs of the entire nation. In the 1940's, all the enterprises rose from the ruins of the war, incidentally, on the same foundations and with the same prewar equipment. All of this led to an extreme degree of backwardness, and the plant was at the end of the line. No treatment facilities would help things. A fundamental reconstruction of all the enterprises of

ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy was required on the basis of employing new waste-free or low-waste, ecologically clean production methods. The entire nation needs our products, and for this reason we request aid from the government, realizing all the difficulties related to this. Possibly, as an exception, the Zaporozhye enterprises should be permitted to conclude contracts for reconstruction with foreign firms under the conditions of subsequent repayment in metal or other types of products produced in the oblast. If the experiment is a success, it could be repeated in other cities. Sooner or later life itself will force us to take this step.

A third question which I would like to raise. It is a question of social justice. In the press, as is seen from the debates at our congress, certain comrades primitively reduce this merely to depriving the so-called bureaucrats of their illegally obtained goods. We are pleased that Mikhail Sergeyevich in his report proposed establishing a commission to review all these benefits. I do not want to reduce the essence of the question merely to this. I would like to ask the question of why, regardless of the constant propaganda by our press for the various types of cooperatives, the working class is largely hostile to them. Because the cooperatives have not produced tangible fruits. And the possibility of obtaining enormous income has caused excitement in the minds of many people. As a result, we are observing a clear outflow of skilled manpower from the state enterprises. Incidentally, this is skilled—I would even say the most skilled. Here it has been said that it is the smart ones leaving there. They leave for where they can earn more money quickly. I, as a steelcaster, cannot earn such money, and for this reason I want to say: What would happen if we, the skilled steelcasters, left for cooperatives? Then who would produce the high-quality metal for you? Where would you obtain metal for aircraft and satellites? For normal equipment, so that here they did not complain of the combines and other machines? Would you find them in cooperatives? I feel that here it is an issue of the collapse of state enterprises. (Applause). As for the cooperatives, Mikhail Sergeyevich, here, in this auditorium, at the 19th party conference, on the Commission for Preparing a Draft Resolution, you stated to us that you would not allow the cooperatives to steal from the pockets of the workers. I want to report to you that they are not only stealing from our pockets but are undressing us, trying to make off with our very skins. (Applause).

As a consequence of this there has been a polarization: at one end the Soviet millionaires, and at the other, the workers who can barely make ends meet. (Applause). The cooperatives have become a convenient form for legalizing stolen money. (Applause).

Or take another question concerning social justice. Don't let the people of Moscow, Kiev and other inhabitants of capitals take offense here. In Moscow and in the other capital cities, meat and sausages are sold at the state price. Why should I, a steelcaster, and thousands like me, purchase all of this at cooperative prices, although I know that all of this is shipped off to Moscow from my oblast? (Applause). I would like to hear advice from the economists on how to feed people justly.

One last thing. As a Communist, a steelcaster with 30 years experience, and holding an activist position in life all the time, I cannot help but take up one important, in my view, problem. It is the question of the party apparatus. I would request that we not attack it so. Respected Deputy Drutse went so far as to say that I, a brigade leader of the steelcasters, am also a party apparatchik. How can one do such a thing? It is impossible to attack "in general." We were not sent here by the voters to hang labels on one another or sink to interfering in the activities of the State Security Committee and insulting it. We came here to work on our problems. (Applause).

The party apparachiks. How many have I seen! All of them came from the worker collectives. We promoted to the apparatus those who conscientiously carried out their duties. And now they have been left absolutely socially unprotected. (Applause).

I say this because I frequently meet with them. I know many of them. And they tell me: Do you know, Vitaliy, it is hard for us now; we barely even dare admit where we work. Although they are literally being "executed," and "put up against the wall" for the shortage of soap and matches, salt, meat and milk. And who would choose all of this for us to at least feed the people? Comrades, we must not confuse one with the other, we must not cover up and, believe me, we, the working class will understand.

Respected comrade scientists. It is you who created the plans, it is you who palmed off the plans on the Politburo. (Applause). And we fulfilled them. Why, then, have I not heard your constructive proposals here? Although the Moscow group to some degree presented them. But you merely criticize. And whom? Criticize yourselves. Let us begin to see to it that we do not make up and do not force the fulfillment of bad plans. Production must not work for the mere sake of production.

Due to the press, certain hotheads have endeavored to link all the difficulties of restructuring to these fellows from the party apparatus. Probably it is a question of something else, something larger. Having begun with the cadres of the party apparatus, more and more blows are being directed against the party itself. I feel that the fire which has been opened up by the bodies of the CPSU Central Committee against the party staffs cannot be viewed other than as a shot in the back. (Applause).

Comrade deputies! The working class is in favor of restructuring, and there is no return to stagnation. The guarantee for the success of restructuring should be the unity of our actions. We do not have the right to permit ethnic discord, to set one people against the other or isolate one from the other. It is essential to strengthen the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Thank you for the attention. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: The floor is given to Deputy Kirill Trofimovich Mazurov, chairman of the All-Union War and Labor Veterans Council. Deputy Grakhovskiy will speak next.

K.T. Mazurov, pensioner, chairman of the All-Union War and Labor Veterans Council, Moscow (from the All-Union War and Labor Veterans Organization): Comrade deputies! In our nation and society we have accumulated numerous shortages. Here they have mentioned, in addition to such scarcities as sugar, soap and other goods, also an immune insufficiency. We all realize that all these shortages must be eliminated. But I would like to take up one shortage which no one has mentioned: the shortage of gratitude for the veterans who ensured the victory in the Great Patriotic War and who provided for all of us and our children a peaceful life. And they are living, forgive me, under very harsh conditions. (Applause).

My comrades and I, some 75 people's deputies, represent over 50 million pensioners, veterans of the war and labor, the party, and the Armed Forces. In the past, this social group was not considered as a political force. Unfortunately, the inertia of such thinking is still found today. There are even scientific works where respected scientists, in examining the forces of restructuring, put our brother in the same group as the declassed elements. These scientists are unaware that of these 50 million, 10 million war and labor veterans—elderly people—are working and are producing material goods. And an even larger number of persons would still be working if they would eliminate the various impediments such as the so-called "ceilings" on wages and so forth.

The veterans are in no way invalids. They have earned the right to a normal attitude from society. When the All-Union Veterans Organization was organized, the All-Union Veterans Council in 1967 decided to check on how the veterans were living. With the aid of other social organizations and with support from the party and soviet bodies, we checked on the lives of more than 30 million persons. This check showed a gloomy picture, comrades. Over 22 million of our war and labor veterans receive a pension of R60 a month and less. Of this number, 10 million are individuals alone who have no other sources of existence. You can imagine what a life it is for them who have guaranteed our current democracy.

Thousands of letters have been sent to all levels, to the All-Union Veteran Council and to the congress and to the press organs; these letters complain about the state of affairs which has developed in our nation for the older generation. I will not abuse your attention but will merely give certain excerpts from one letter which was received yesterday. It is a collective letter from Yoshkar-Ola, the Mari ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], and which was signed by a large group of war participants. Here is what they write: "Some 44 years have passed since Victory Day. And many victors eke out a meager existence on miserly pensions which have been earned twice by military service and peaceful labor. For decades we have produced and we still repeat fine slogans such as 'No one has forgotten us' and 'Each has been awarded according to merit' and that we are all in an unpaid debt to the war veterans. But when will we pay these debts? In a humane socialist society this is inhumane and antihumane. The solution to this question must not be put off to tomorrow. Certainly we are building and at present are restructuring the most humane and highly moral socialist society in the world. What example we set and how we are able to care for the elderly, particularly the defenders of the motherland, determine not only the moral climate of all society but primarily the attitude toward us of the younger generation, its moral health, and an understanding of the real values of true socialism. It must always be remembered that we reap what we sow and we are sowing.... Let us make a proposal: The year 1990 is to be declared a year of war and labor veterans, and we will actually do everything to free the old soldiers of the ordeals and troubles, the soldiers who seek a pitiable handout from our common table while they themselves made a major contribution to this long ago through their unstinting labor. We must not take from them their last health and belief in those ideals for which they fought, so that at the end of their years, before departing from life, none of them bears hard thoughts or an insult from the state. (Loskutov, Senatorov, Mosunov, Fedorin, Shvetsov, Mitin, Savelyev, Semenov, Cherkasov, Krylov, Medvedev and others)...."

The All-Union Veterans Council has repeatedly examined these questions and submitted proposals to the central leadership bodies. A number of decisions has been taken. I must tell the truth. After April 1985, the Central Committee and government have done a good deal in this regard. But all of these have been less than fundamental measures. The veterans are demanding a fundamental solution to the question. We must feed these people primarily; we must show affection primarily for them. And recently the situation has developed in such a way that as a consequence of the uncontrolled rise in prices for goods and the erosion of cheap goods, the situation of the war and labor veterans and those who have earned a special attitude towards themselves has recently become simply intolerable.

I feel that far from all the deputies have any idea of in what a calamitous state the veterans of the Great Patriotic War live. It is essential to solve this painful problem. We, the 75 people's deputies of the veteran organization, have submitted concrete proposals to the congress, and request that they be reviewed either by a special commission or instruct the Supreme Soviet this very year to resolve the following questions:

1. To find, already this year, R400 million in order to bring the pensions up to a subsistence minimum for the war veterans and the military widows who receive R50 a month and less. (Applause).

2. In the new pension law, review the question of providing the veterans and partisans with a priority status and grounds for receiving increased pensions. We are the only nation of our allies which participated in

World War II where the veterans, the fighters of the front and the partisan rear, have not received special pensions, but have received working pensions and the lowest ones.

3. We should begin carrying out the new law in 1990, even before its ratification. And in 1990, we should not begin by regions, as has always been done before, but rather by social groups in increasing the pensions to a subsistance minimum, primarily for the participants in the war and the labor veterans who receive pensions under R60 a month.

I propose that the congress support this proposal.

But this is not the only question. The veterans have not been shown sincere attention. Particularly valuable in this regard are the statements recently published in the newspaper SOVETSKAYA KULTURA by the well known artists Lyudmila Zykina, Yuriy Nikulin, Alla Pugacheva, Irma Sakhadze, Gennadiy Khazanov, and other of our well-known cultural figures, under the motto "The Warmth of Our Hearts for the Veterans." They have urged writers, composers, scientists, artists, and actors to participate in the life of the veterans, particularly those who live in residential homes and our almshouses, and to deduct from fees and from concerts certain amounts directly for these veteran homes as well as to the charity and health fund which has also been organized for these purposes. They write in their appeal: "However, man does not live by bread alone. We are thousands, if not hundreds of thousands. If each of us just once a year would visit the veterans, this would be a continuous line of an unending noble deed—this will be our contribution to great restructuring which has aroused the finest traditions of humanism in the Russian and Soviet multinational culture." We feel that this noble movement should touch the hearts not only of the creative intelligentsia.

The next question. We, the frontline veterans and the partisans who with each passing year are fewer and fewer (approximately 400,000 leave us forever each year), are bothered and insulted not only by the callous attitude of the bureaucrats, but also by the frequently appearing insulting and disrespectful attitude by a certain portion of our citizens. Certain partisans and frontline veterans are reticent to wear their combat orders. They put them on only on 9 May because they do not want to hear insulting comments in the store lines, on streetcars and buses. Such an immoral attitude toward the war veterans, unfortunately, is fostered by frequent publications in our press in which the 70-year history of our country is represented as a solid chain of mistakes and crimes, and the entire older generation is to blame for these crimes.

It is inadmissible when, in analyzing the military period of our history, some draw irresponsible conclusions, blackening the military feat of the people, giving humiliating descriptions of the Red Army Command, and mocking the Soviet soldier, although they should bow down to the ground to him for the fact that they live free. (Applause).

Soon it will be 45 years since the war ended, and still thousands of unknown Soviet soldiers still remain unburied, their bones turning white in trenches overgrown by brush, in the forests and swamps of Novgorod, Leningrad and certain other oblasts, where the hottest fighting against the Nazis occurred. Many fraternal graves and monuments have been abandoned, and in some places they have simply been torn down. Our thanks to the Komsomol for being actively concerned with research work and seeking out the war heroes, but it is not the job of the Komsomol any more than the old veterans to commit the remains of the dead to the ground or to properly bury deceased veterans. This is a matter for the corresponding executive committees of the soviets who have forgotten these sacred duties of theirs.

The veterans are also indignant over the fact that up to now Moscow has no monument to the Great Victory. (Applause). The Museum of the Great Patriotic War and the Victory Park are being turned into a long drawn-out project and significant amounts of money collected by the people have been wasted.

Comrades, we must show particular concern for our younger generation. Comrade Gorbachev and other deputies have already said here that there are numerous negative phenomena among our youth. Our young people live in inactivity. It is paradoxical, but still a fact, that in our state the children working in a majority of families are raised for "doing nothing." The question of labor in our country is overshadowed by the question of leisure. Both in the countryside and in the city the juveniles often grow up under conditions of idleness; they roam about the streets, deafening their ears with rock music, strumming on guitars, humming senseless tunes, and giving vent to unspent youthful energy.

The Komsomol has submitted a proposal to adopt a Youth Law. But it seems to me that the question is more complex. I would like to make a proposal to instruct the Supreme Soviet to work out an overall plan for the comprehensive labor, moral, and cultural education of the younger generation, with a priority for socially useful physical labor (applause) and bring this problem to the level of state policy.

A few words on the course of discussing our restructuring processes. May I request one more minute of attention?

Restructuring to which the party has raised our people is a very serious undertaking. A difficult undertaking. Each step requires a thoughtful, competent approach. But as before, we often show incompetence and a hurry in adopting new decisions and laws, and this is no guarantee against new mistakes.

We are constantly urging each to work at full strength in his job. These appeals remain mere good intentions without increasing the demands placed on each of us by society. Each should work at full strength under the control of all! This is the sort of slogan that is needed.

The crisis phenomena in the economy and in providing the people with everything essential are explained not only by the timidity of the legislators and the conservatism of the apparatus. The shortcomings in carrying out economic reform are to be explained by banal lack of discipline, by the absence of order and exactingness, and even, I would say, by certain concessions by our state bodies.

In society not only have ideas appeared, but also the prophets and the structures are forming, which repudiate socialism and argue in favor of capitalist-type market relations and even a multiparty system. These are prophets who are incompatible with our ideology, but they are not being given a proper rebuff. If we do not have laws which provide social protection for the people, which strictly regulate socialist law and order and protect the rights of the individual, including the leaders who have the trust of the people, and if we do not ensure their strict execution by each citizen, then we will receive not the flourishing of democracy but rather the tyranny of permissiveness and anarchy.

We, the people's deputies, bear great responsibility in preventing such things. Comrade Gorbachev has spoken here about the consolidation of forces. This is a correct slogan. Not the fanning of passions at the congress itself and among the voters, but rather a comradely comparison of opinions and the adoption of the most effective decisions—this is the law of our congress and all our deputies.

Under the conditions of the active involvement of the broad masses of workers in all spheres of life, and under the conditions of the diversity of opinions and the learning of the rudiments of democracy by the people, only under the leadership of the Communist Party can the people realize restructuring. There is no other way. Thank you. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: The floor is turned over to Deputy Aleksandr Adamovich Grakhovskiy.

A.A. Grakhovskiy, chairman of the ispolkom [executive committee] of Gomel Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies (Rechitsa National-Territorial Electoral District, Belorussian SSR): Dear comrade deputies! I would like to devote the bulk of my statement to our national tragedy—the accident at the Chernobyl AES. And I would ask your forgiveness for beginning with a situation that is so sad and simultaneously so shameful for us. With every passing day the accident recedes farther and farther into history, but it has not lost its seriousness. Today it is one of the most painful situations in our public life. But first of all it is the heartfelt pain, the unrest, and the tribulations of the population that has suffered. Because the alarm and the concern that we heard in the statement made by a poet whom we respect, Boris Ilich Oleynik, is closer to us and more understandable by us than by anyone else.

I would also like to dwell on this question because the elimination of the consequences of the accident requires not only, and not so much, local efforts, but primarily the participation of the entire country.

We suffered this misfortune from the very first days of the accident. And today we carry the brunt of its consequences on our shoulders. Our burden is certainly no light one, since, with regard to the percentage of the contaminated territory in the European part of the USSR, Gomel Oblast occupies the leading place.

I would like you to understand the following. I am speaking from this high rostrum as one of the direct participants in the work on eliminating the consequences of the accident. I am speaking about this not with the purpose of advertising myself, but so that you can be completely aware of our everyday concerns and alarms.

At first we did not remain in bitter solitude. The entire country came to our assistance, thanks to which a series of operations were carried out to resolve the first-priority tasks. However, the steps that are being taken are not removing the seriousness of the situation. The radiation situation on the territory of the oblast remains complicated. Practical experience and scientific prognosis indicate that we should not expect any substantial improvement of the situation within the next few years.

We carried out the evacuation of the population in three stages. As of today, there are inhabited places in the oblast where the carrying out of agricultural reclamation measures in combination with engineer decontamination and the improvement of services and utilities does not guarantee people's safe residence. It will be necessary to carry out a fourth resettlement. But in order for it to be the last one, it is necessary to consider in the most serious manner the radiation situation and the possible dosage loads that have been placed on each individual inhabited place.

Nor can we remove from the agenda the problems in the social and everyday spheres. The USSR Ministry of Public Health, within the shortest period of time, must make a determination with regard to this problem, and must make the appropriate recommendation to us. I feel that it is appropriate to turn to scientists as a whole. And to appeal to you, our respected scientific comrades, to increase considerably the intensity of scientific-research work as a whole in our Chernobyl area, which—implying no offense to you—was the result also of your activity. Here I completely share the point of view of respected Vasiliy Ivanovich Belov. Unfortunately, during the three years since the accident, we have not received an effective technological scheme, or any mechanisms or means to decontaminate the inhabited places or the agricultural land, and a number of other problems and questions continue to be unresolved.

As a result of the isolation of a considerable amount of the land, and also the need to supply the population in the contaminated territory with shipped-in meat and dairy products, the food question in the oblast has become seriously complicated. The losses incurred by the oblast, and its needs to provide the population with food products in conformity with the scientifically substantiated standards, are not being taken into consideration by the planning agencies.

As you can see, the situation is obviously abnormal, and it is creating increased social tension. We constantly raised these questions at USSR Gosplan and USSR Gosagroprom, and the Politburo of CPSU Central Committee issued instructions to deal with them, but so far no practical measures have been taken. We feel that the union shipments should be adjusted in order to taken into consideration our losses and the additional need to supply the population in the territory that has suffered. Our population has found itself in a disastrous situation not of its own fault, and its interests must be defended.

The questions of providing monetary grants to the population as a result of the limitation of the consumption of food products from the citizens' private plots have not been completely resolved. Persons of retirement age have proven to be in an especially difficult situation. More than 40,000 retirees who have been affected by the misfortune at Chernobyl have pensions that are below the average minimum income—approximately R50, or, more accurately, R47. Even under normal conditions it is very difficult to live on this kind of income, and under our conditions it is even more difficult. The resolution this question as rapidly as possible is our duty and, of course, our conscience.

You are well aware of how critical the question of providing highly qualified medical services to our population is. The necessary construction to create the appropriate medical institutions is under way, but there is nothing to fill them with: There continues to be a shortage of medical equipment, instruments, and medicines. With the current approaches, we shall not receive Soviet-produced equipment soon. The only way out is to purchase it abroad. We are well aware that the country does not have any extra currency, but, taking the unusual nature of the situation into consideration, it must be found somewhere.

There are problems in improving the health of the population, and especially that of children. We have begun to create our own base outside the confines of the oblast, but without assistance from outside, we will not be able to resolve this task. Questions of providing the population with personal radiation meters and other monitoring devices have been raised repeatedly. Instructions with regard to this question have also been issued by Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, but the radiation meters and devices continue to be nonexistent. It seems to us that the time has come to ask several individuals to give a serious accounting of their lack of action.

Because of the contamination of a considerable amount of the forest area and peat bogs, there has been an annual reduction in the procurement of firewood and in the production of peat briquets. The shortage of fuel produced by the oblast will be more than 40 percent by the middle of the 13th Five-Year Plan. This circumstance, as well the medical and sanitation conditions in the territory, require the taking of immediate steps to decontaminate the entire oblast. In order to resolve promptly the Chernobyl and other serious social problems, we must carry out in a considerably more dynamic manner the construction of housing and of structures in the social and personal-services sphere. We do not ask to have construction workers sent to us from other parts of the country. But in this situation we feel that it necessary, starting next year, to release us from the construction of housing in Tyumen and, practically speaking, to stop the industrial construction in the oblast.

The list of unresolved questions and problems is a large one, but it could be considerably shorter if the USSR governmental commission on eliminating the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES were to work more dynamically, and if it dealt not only with the nuclear power station, but also with the entire territory that has suffered. At the present time this list must be brought into the system. It is necessary for each point to determine the measures, time limits, executors, and funds. Taking into consideration the fact that the elimination of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES is something that will take a long time, the participation of union agencies is mandatory. We feel that there is a critical need during the current year, on the basis of an analysis of what has been done and also of the scientific forecasts, to develop in the country a Comprehensive USSR State Program for Eliminating the Consequences of the Accident at the Chernobyl AES. And in order for this document to be mandatory for everyone, it must be approved at USSR Supreme Soviet.

This major measure will have a positive effect on the safety of the population and on the sociopolitical mood of a large part of the country, and will preclude a large number of approaches and primarily the speculation on the misfortune at Chernobyl. It will make it possible in a more meaningful manner to move forward along the path of fundamental socioeconomic and political reforms.

Comrades! The course of our congress, like the processes that have been occurring in the outlying areas, invite each of us to make very profound reflections. On the one hand, one can understand the attempt of the deputies to guarantee the stable and irreversible development of democracy and glasnost, and the most rapid resolution of the socioeconomic, interethnic, ecological, and other problems. On the other hand, one cannot fail to note that certain deputies are attempting to lead us away from the cardinal resolutions of the critical questions, and are making the attempt to force their point of view, which is at times a dubious one, on us. Instead of thoroughly studying the deeply underlying causes of a particular

negative process and working out practical measures to resolve it, they call for rally-style democracy and for prolonged discussions and conversations which are necessary and which at times do little to help the situation.

I accept democratization and glasnost only if people have high self-discipline, organizational spirit, and responsibility for the job assigned to them, and if the person is completely aware of his role in society. In all their other manifestations, they take the form of demagoguery, with elements of anarchy and laxity. (Applause).

Therefore I want to support the appeals that have been made in this auditorium—appeals for more constructive work, for the consolidation of all our efforts, and the responsible attitude of the deputies toward the resolution of the problems confronting us. Comrades, this is exceptionally important. Our congress must become, for the nation, a model, a school of an efficient, creative, profoundly interpreted approach to bringing our country out of its present condition.

I cannot agree with individual deputies who propose immediately, even before forming agencies of the congress or the government, to start to adopt laws and decrees. Of course we need laws. But I propose that developing a good legislative draft is no simple matter. Speed is not necessary here. Today it is completely obvious that, even earlier, much that was well thought-out, as a result of the hastiness in making a number of decisions and the failure to evaluate completely the possible socioeconomic consequences, received distorted development. This can be said about the weak aspects of the Law Governing the State Enterprise and the Law Governing the Cooperative System, and also about the measures to combat drunkenness and alcoholism.

Therefore, when developing the legislative drafts, it is more intelligent to rely on qualified legal thinking, on the national traditions and territorial peculiarities, the wisdom of all the peoples in our country, and the experience existing in the outlying areas. That is why I support the broad representation of all the social segments of the population in the USSR Supreme Soviet. Its formation simply according to the principle of the professionalism of the deputies cannot be a guarantee of the perfection of its functions. Each of us can participate constantly in the work of the Supreme Soviet, while maintaining a connection with his representation. And in this instance none of us should be insulted or vilified.

As a Communist and as a citizen, I am especially concerned that wholesale disparagement of the party cadres has begun. They were subjected to massive attacks during the election campaign, and we must not close our eyes to this. Their opponents did not balk at anything. They used false rumors, the falsification of the actual state of affairs, and other methods. I do not remove the responsibility from them, just as I do not remove it from any category of workers, for the miscalculations that they make or for the major shortcomings in society. We are all collectively guilty, and we must all work together to bring society to a new qualitative level. But the chosen method can lead to a loss of efficient cadres, and it is causing a large amount of harm to the party as a whole. And this will only harm our common cause. (Applause.)

B.Ye. Paton: Comrade deputies, inasmuch as time is running short, let us agree that Deputy Neumyvakin, who has already been scheduled to speak, will be given the floor after a lunch break. Are there any objections?

Voices from the floor: No.

B.Ye. Paton: Let us move on. On the instructions of the congress Presidium, Deputy Endel Teodorovich Lippmaa of the Estonian SSR will take the floor to make a proposal.

E.T. Lippmaa, director of the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Chemical and Biological Physics, Tallinn (Tallinnskiy-Tsentralnyy Electoral Okrug, Estonian SSR): Esteemed congress and esteemed guests! Many delegations and many speeches here have raised the question of the 1939 treaties with Nazi Germany. We are submitting a draft resolution for the analysis of these most complex problems. The draft runs as follows: "USSR Congress of People's Deputies resolution on setting up a commission to legally appraise the Soviet-German nonaggression treaty of 1939, the so-called Molotov-Ribbentrop pact, and the secret additional protocol to the pact." The USSR Congress of People's Deputies decrees: First, to make a political and legal appraisal of the Soviet-German nonaggression treaty of 1939 and the secret additional protocol—that is, the protocol on territorial and political reorganization in Eastern Europe, in particular in the Baltic area and Poland—and related documents, a commission should be set up comprising the following USSR people's deputies: Commission members: Lyudmila Akopovna Arutyunyan, department head at the Yerevan State University, Yerevan; Georgiy Arkadyevich Arbatov, director of the United States of America and Canada Institute; Yuriy Nikolayevich Afanasyev, rector of the Moscow State Historical Archives Institute, Moscow; Ilmar Olgertovich Bisher, professor at the Latvian Stuchka State University, Riga; Mavrik Germanovich Vulfson, senior teacher at the Latvian Academy of Arts, Riga; Igor Nikolayevich Gryazin, department chief at the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law, Tartu; Aleksey Ivanovich Kazannik, department lecturer at Omsk State University, Omsk; Vitaliy Alekseyevich Korotich, chief editor of the journal OGONEK, Moscow; Vitautas Vitautovich Landsbergis, professor at the Lithuanian SSR State Conservatory, Vilnius; Maryu Yokhannesovna Lauristin, department head at Tartu State University, Tartu; Endel Teodorovich Lippmaa, director of the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Chemical and Biological Physics, Tallinn; Kazimir Vladislavovich Moteka, lawyer at the

1st Vilnius Legal Consultancy, Vilnius; Nikolay Vasilyevich Neyland, Latvian SSR deputy foreign minister, Riga; Edgar Elmarovich Savisaar, deputy director of the "Maynor" Special Planning and Design Bureau, Tallinn; Zita Leonovna Shlichite, lawyer at the Klaypeda Legal Consultancy, Klaypeda; Aleksey Mikhaylovich Ridiger, Metropolitan Aleksiy of Leningrad and Novgorod, Leningrad; and Valentin Mikhaylovich Falin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department. Also one representative each for the Ukrainian, Belorussian, and Moldavian delegations. Incidentally, we also had suggestions on three possible candidates from the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Moldavia. Although, of course, it is a matter for their delegations, they were: Vladimir Ilarionovich Shinkaruk, director of the Institute of Philosophy; Vasiliy Vladimirovich Bykov, writer; and Ion Panteleyevich Drutse, writer. We propose Chingiz Aytmatov, writer, Frunze, as chairman of the commission. That is number one.

Second, the USSR Foreign Ministry and other departments and archives are to make available to the commission all the essential materials.

Third, the commission is to present its conclusion to the USSR Supreme Soviet by the end of this June and publish the results of its activity.

The question remains: Why such haste? Because 23 August this year is the 50th anniversary of the agreement with Hitler on the partitioning of Europe. Therefore we must do something right away. Moreover, there were proposals that the pact should be immediately denounced from the moment it was signed. This is not a bad proposal but, in the first place, many of our deputies do not know the text and, in the second place, this is not enough. Conclusions must be drawn fromn this. Declaring invalidity alone is not enough. Much flows from this, so the commission must be set up anyway. This draft was drawn up by deputies from the Estonian delegation with the active participation of Lithuania and Latvia, but, above all, our Presidium.

B.Ye. Paton: Comrade deputies, if there are no objections, let us approve the proposal put to us and vote. Any objections?

From the floor: No.

B.Ye. Paton: And the title of the commission? Deputy Yarovoy.

V.I. Yarovoy, director of the " 'Dvigatel' State V.I. Lenin Union Plant," Tallinn (Tallinnskiy-Lasnamyaeskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug): Comrade deputies! There is much talk about this pact in the country as a whole and particularly in the Baltic region. For 18 months the indigenous population has actually been indoctrinated concerning this pact, and distrust has been aroused if the Estonian section of the population. As a result the non-Estonian part has been turned into "occupiers," "colonialists," and who knows what else. I believe that the commission which has been drawn up on the initiative of the Estonian deputies should not be allowed to consider the issue, because they have a stake in the solution of this question. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: Any more proposals, anyone else want to speak?

M.S. Gorbachev: There was a question comrades wanted to ask.

B.Ye. Paton: They ask for the title of the commission, the aim of the commission.

E.T. Lippmaa: The commission's aim is simple. So that there are no misunderstandings, so that we can move forward well and effectively. Not to kindle disagreements, but to solve the question, so that there is no superfluous discussion and we can work in a businesslike way.

B.Ye. Paton: Question, please.

Academician Zh.I. Alferov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences A.F. Ioffe Physical and Technical Institute, Leningrad (from the USSR Academy of Sciences): I have a purely legal question about the treaty having lost its validity. I understood that the Molotov-Ribbentrop treaty lost its validity with the start of the war, on 22 June. (Applause).

One can forumulate one's attitude to the treaty very clearly. Like many others, I believe that the treaty was a disgraceful phenomenon in our history. But do we really need to discuss whether it has ceased to be valid or not? It ceased to be valid on 22 June, when the war started. (Applause).

V.V. Ivanov, doctor of philological sciences, sector chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Slavic and Balkan Studies, Moscow (from the USSR Academy of Sciences): I want to make a proposal on the procedure for discussing this question. The question is extremely important—perhaps one of the most important we are discussing at this session, and I would like to draw attention to the actual discussion procedure. Delegations from three republics have made a proposal. Of course, we could reject it by an absolute majority and thereby plunge ourselves into yet another very significant conflict within our federative state. I suggest using the method of consensus, which we use too little anyway. We do not need to bother with majority and minority. It is a method that has historically shown itself to be incorrect. We must seek a consensus. And it seems to me that proposals from three republics are enough for the congress to adopt this proposal by consensus. (Applause).

V.M. Semenov, secretary of Grodno Belorussian Communist Party Oblast Committee, Grodno (Grodnenskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Belorussian SSR): Comrades! As you can see, I am from western Belorussia. I am speaking on a procedural issue. We could end up with too many proposals, including urgent, serious, and important ones. We must not put all questions to the congress alone. I have a proposal: Instruct the newly elected Supreme Soviet to consider this issue.

Deputy (he did not give his name): Esteemed deputies, esteemed comrades in the Presidium. I support the comrade from western Belorussia and I want to say that we must set up a commission on Chernobyl, on the tragedy that occurred. And these secondary issues can wait. Because it was not only Belorussia and the Ukraine that were affected, but Russia too. The Supreme Soviet Presidium could decide these issues and submit them to our congress for its decision. And let us be constructive and businesslike in our approach to issues. Let us solve these issues. After all, the electorate expects really concrete action from us.

V.A. Berezov, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, Vilnius (Tauragskiy National Territorial Electoral Okrug, Lithuanian SSR): I am a Russian. I ask you, deputies, to support this commission. It is the most painful issue for the Baltic peoples. And these problems must be solved. Because we are not discussing the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. You have received the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet's appeal. It has been distributed to everyone. The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet is calling for a solution to this problem. It is a question not of the pact itself, but of the secret Molotov-Ribbentrop treaties. These secret treaties are being talked about all the time: They do not exist, they have been lost, and so on. And we deputies from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia cannot go home without solving this question. I beg you to back the commission. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: Please, go ahead.

I.Ya. Kezbers, Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Secretary, Riga (Kuldigskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Latvian SSR): Esteemed colleagues, there are many urgent questions, urgent issues. I represent Latvia. As we often say, that is one percent in many indicators. That is true. But our history is as dear to us as the entire history of our socialist homeland. I believe that it is necessary to back this commission and the idea of investigating this question, and we must at last give our people an answer: Yes, there have been black spots and blank spaces, but we are assessing them fairly. Therefore I ask you to support the proposal that has been made. (Applause).

I.N. Gryazin, department chief at the Estonian SSR Institute of Philosophy, Sociology, and Law, Tartu (Pyarnuskiy National-Territorial Okrug, Estonian SSR): This question has already been touched on: What to do with these treaties and protocols? It is a legal question. Denounce or not denounce? Annul or not annul? Incidentally, some suggested the rather original idea that part of the treaties lost their validity in 1941. An original idea, which also deserves consideration. And that is why the commission is being set up.

What are we talking about? Excuse me, but these eight lines of text need to be read out loud. "Moscow, 23 August 1939. Point one. In the event of teritorial and political transformations in areas belonging to the Baltic states—Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania—the northern border of Lithuania will be the line separating the spheres of influence of Germany and the USSR. In this connection Lithuania's stake in the Vilno area is recognized by both sides. Second, in the event of territorial and political transformations in areas belonging to the Polish state, the spheres of influence of Germany and the USSR will be demarcated approximately by a line following the Narew, Wisla, and San rivers."

Further on there is a very interesting bit: "The question of whether it is desirable in the interests of both sides to preserve the independence of the Polish state and the question of the borders of that state can only be finally decided by the course of future political events. In any case, the two governments will resolve this question by means of a friendly agreement. Third. Concerning Southeast Europe. The Soviet side has indicated its interest in Bessarabia. The German side has clearly stated its total lack of interest politically in these territories. Fourth. This protocol is regarded as strictly secret by both sides. Signed by Joachim von Ribbentrop for the Government of Germany and by Vyacheslav Molotov, plenipotentiary representative of the Government of the USSR."

There is the text. That is what we are talking about. Correct or incorrect? What do we do with it? The commission is needed for this purpose. We cannot decide now; we need a commission. I ask you to vote for the commission. Thank you. (Applause. Noise in the hall).

E.E. Inkens, senior editor in the Latvian SSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting main television news editorial office, Riga (Tsesiskiy National-Territorial Electoral Okrug, Latvian SSR): I want to talk about the special significance these treaties have for the Baltic region. What we are saying here today is unprecedented. The whole world knows full well that these protocols exist. We in the Baltic area have also know this for a long time. And the reluctance to examine them here is like covering your ears when the truth is being told. And another thing. This treaty has not been eliminated, because, despite the outbreak of war in 1941, the Soviet Union concluded a special treaty with the emigre Polish government (in London) on the partial denunciation of this treaty. So, unfortunately, it still has some influence. And most importantly, the pernicious part of the treaty relates to the period 1939-1940. That is the period of annexations in the Baltic area.

Yu.Yu. Boldyrev, senior engineer at the Central Scientific Research Istitute of Marine Electrical Engineering and Technology, Leningrad (Moskovskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Leningrad, RSFSR): Esteemed comrades! I do not have a vested interest. I doubt whether there is any need at all to persuade you of the importance of this issue. But I want to draw your attention to the results of today's and yesterday's sessions. What we are doing is absolutely intolerable. Esteemed deputies, none of us, in my view, has the moral right to assess and challenge other deputies. Only our voters should have the right to assess us. Passions are being fueled here at the moment, yet in fact a perfectly concrete and clear proposal has been made: Decide nothing here; set up a commission to examine the issue and have the results of the commission's work submitted for your perusal. In this situation, it seems to me, it is quite out of order to challenge these people and say that they have a vested interest. I believe that if anyone sees fit to add their own representatives to the commission, this must be done. Thank you for listening.

B.Ye. Paton: Esteemed comrade, just one moment. I can see nine more wanting to speak. Let us give them each a minute. Please.

R.A. Medvedev, writer (Voroshilovskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Moscow): Comrades, I think our tempestuous reaction is due not only to the fact that a commission has been proposed. I have no doubt that the commission is necessary. It is a matter of the membership of the commission. As a historian, I must tell you that we Soviet historians are not ashamed to say that Russia conquered Central Asia. We are not ashemed to say that Russia conquered even the North Caucasus. We are not ashamed to hang the celebrated picture "Yermak's Conquest of Siberia" in our museums. But hitherto, in our official works of history, in our articles, in our publications appearing in Moscow, we have written that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania joined the Soviet Union voluntarily, that it was a people's revolution, that there was no violence and there were no threats, and that it was a full, voluntary expression of the will of the Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian peoples. This is untrue. It was, of course, an action that occurred when an imperialist war was taking place and when no one—not just the Soviet Union but Germany, Japan, Britain, and France—showed any respect for the rights of small countries and peoples, and when problems were being tackled without regard for the neutrality of Belgium, the Netherlands, Finland, or other countries. So the commission must be set up and we must finally make a correct assessment of these treaties. But the commission must include not only authoritative representatives from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. The commission must have other state figures from our country on it. I am surprised to hear comrades proposing, for example, Chingiz Aytmatov, a man respected by me and by all of us, as chairman of the commission, and not Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, for example. That is, I propose that the decisions be made to set up the commission, but that its membership be looked at again by the deputies from the Estonian and Latvian SSR's, in conjunction with the congress Presidium and members of the Soviet Government and Politburo. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev: Comrades, may I speak out of turn? Just to make this issue somewhat clearer. It is an old problem, one that has been discussed and studied by historians, by political scientists, and by the relevant departments. And I have to say that while we have been holding scientific discussions in certain departments, all the documents, including the secret appendix to the treaty, have been published everywhere. The Baltic press has published everything. But all efforts to find the original of the secret treaty have failed. Those who are dealing with these matters will note that I broached the matter in conversation with the Polish comrades and with the Polish press, and in my concluding remarks on the topic following my meeting with the Polish intelligentsia.

We have been dealing with this question for a long time. There are no originals. There are copies, but it is not known what they are copies of. They are signed, but what creates doubts, particularly for us, is the fact that Molotov's signature is in German letters. When Chancellor Kohl was here—it was, as they say, a one-on-one discussion, but since the issue is turning out this way it obviously must be said, and I do not think the chancellor will be very offended if I reveal this secret—there were matters of a purely confidential nature, one-on-one. In particular, I asked him: Do you have the originals of these treaties, the appendix? He replied that they had them. I said: Then would you please give them to us. And on the basis of that understanding we sent Foreign Ministry representatives. Eduard Amvrosiyevich? Yes. But the originals were not found there, either.

This is, so to speak, information to mull over. A serious question that requires scientific and political analysis. I do not want to oversimplify the issue; it must be discussed and evaluated, as the comrades have proposed. So I would advocate the creation of a commission, since it has been requested by several delegations. But I would ask the comrades to look again at who should be on the commission. I think this commission should be expanded, and therefore the congress and the Presidium, which made the proposal, should be asked to provide the time for this. On the basis of consultations with our scientists and with the Academy of Sciences competent people should be placed on the commission, because it is a very serious question. That is number one.

Number two: In view of the special information I have provided, including the conversations with Mr Kohl, I would not at this early stage call the proposal "On the formation of a commission...." In the first place there are different interpretations. The proposal is on the elaboration of a political and legal appraisal, and it is called: "On a legal appraisal of the Soviet-German nonaggression treaty and the secret additional protocol to the pact...." We do not have the secret protocol at the moment, so we cannot evaluate it. But I do think there

should be a commission; I would certainly go along with that. It must elaborate a political and legal appraisal of this nonaggression treaty without mentioning the secret protocol, since all the archives we have rummaged through here have not provided an answer. Although I will tell you that the historians know and would tell you that what happened was that two powerful forces were moving toward one another, and at some point this coming into contact came to a complete halt. Something lay at the basis of it. But all we are doing is debating at the moment. So it requires an investigation, an analysis of all the documents, of the entire situation as it occurred, including the way the Soviet Government dealt with the treaty when the war started.... What we did was deem it invalid.

This full range of issues, I think, must be evaluated, because the Baltic republics are frantically discussing these issues, and, as a result, it is being questioned whether the will of the people came into it at all when they joined the Soviet Union. That is scarcely the case. All this must be studied. So I would have the congress set up a commission to provide a political and legal appraisal of the Soviet-German treaty, and after it has been formed at the relevant level, let it get down to work and give its competent judgment on this issue. I do not even know if it will get at the truth in its first attempt. It is no simple matter, but since it exists I believe that we must not try to duck it. Let us not duck it; let us get on and study it. As we have said, in the course of restructuring there are very many acute problems. If the comrades consider it necessary to obtain some more information before making a decision on the composition of the commission, to have some preliminary ideas from the Foreign Ministry, we can ask Comrade Shevardnadze to speak on the matter. But I think the chief thing is to set up the commission correctly, for it to get to work, and then either the Supreme Soviet or all the deputies will be informed of the results of the commission's work. That is my clarification. We might confine ourselves to it now, and if the comrades support the idea of creating a commission, then the Presidium should be given time to continue consultations, to provide it with competent people. Is that right, comrades?

From the hall: Right!

M.S. Gorbachev: Fine, settled, then.

From the hall: (Inaudible).

M.S. Gorbachev: No, comrades, Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze is not a deputy. Ministers are not deputies. Let us instruct some deputies. There are two international affairs experts from our Central Committee and from the Politburo there is Comrade Yakovlev. Let us have Yakovlev on the commission. OK? (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: Comrade deputies! As I see it, the proposal on the advisability of setting up a commission is therefore accepted by everyone. As for the membership, Mikhail Sergeyevich has made a proposal. I think we all accept this proposal: To instruct the Baltic delegations and the Presidium to consider the matter further, since the commission must include more professionals and experts on this issue.

Is the proposal accepted? Thank you.

(Noise in the hall).

B.Ye. Paton: You want a vote? Vote for what? For the advisability of setting up a commission? I mean, we cannot vote for the members as they stand. So it is just the advisability of a commission. I think no one objects to that? Accepted?

From the hall: Accepted.

B.Ye. Paton: Esteemed comrade deputies! The Presidium has received many requests and comments on the fact that many deputies have not been given the floor, that lists are being changed, and so on. I am authorized by the Presidium to announce that around 500 requests to speak in the debate have been received. That is number one. Number two, the Presidium looks at the lists of speakers twice a day to ensure that all regions, republics, public organizations, and so on are represented, so that no one is offended. During the dinner break the list will be drawn up for the evening session. It seems to us that this is the only possible solution in such a complex situation.

I also want to announce that the Presidium receives memoranda that are more or less identical. I will read out a very short one. It is from Valentin Fedorovich Romanov of Magnitogorsk: "Notes on debate procedure: One. It seems to me that during the debates we often display particular inspiration and a splenetic single-mindedness in exposing shortcomings by the spadeful. Although criticism cannot be made in strict doses, the time has come to change the emphasis from the viewpoint of seeking proper ways out of the present situation and not simply stating shortcomings which are familiar to us all. And the criticism must be courteous and benevolent. Two, the tactic of trying to intimidate the congress, where certain speeches end with the words 'there could be unforeseen consequences,' must be abandoned. We are building a state in which the consequences must be foreseeable, so ultimatums are not our way." (Applause). There have been similar memoranda from groups of deputies and I am not going to read them out.

Since the situation concerning those wishing to speak is so strained, let me read out a memorandum to the congress Presidium from Deputy Vasilyev: "Please read out the proposals. For the USSR people's deputies who, because of the lack of time, do not have the chance to speak from the congress platform, but would like the pages of the central newspapers to be used as a platform and these newspaper items published during the congress

to be regarded as speeches at the congress itself and entered in the stenographic record for the relevant day." This is not a bad idea, I think.

Let me make some very brief announcements now, comrades.

First, since there have been questions about registering to speak on the USSR Council of Ministers chairman's report, the Presidium has authorized me to inform you that registration will begin after the Council of Ministers chairman's speech.

Editorial commission chairman Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev has asked me to inform the commission members that the editorial commission will meet at the start of the break in the Hall of Mirrors and asks the commission members to make their way there.

A request from the doctors: To announce a meeting of all doctor-deputies here, in the hall, at the start of the long interval. There is a similar request from people's deputies working in industry. But it does not specify where and when they want to meet.

Finally, what is in my view a very interesting memorandum to the effect that People's Deputy Nikolay Andreyevich Kasyan, whom we all know very well, is prepared to give medical assistance to any participant of our congress. (Applause).

Allow me to announce that we are taking a break until 1600.

Eighth Session

1 June 1989. Kremlin Palace of Congresses. 1600.

USSR People's Deputy B.Ye. Paton presiding.

B.Ye. Paton: Dear comrade deputies, we are continuing the discussion of the question of the "Basic Directions for the Domestic and Foreign Policy of the USSR." In conformity with the understanding, the congress Presidium has discussed and is making known to you a list of the speakers who have been scheduled for today's evening session:

Aleksandr Yakovlevich Neumyvakin, chairman of the Central Board of the All-Russian Society of the Blind;
Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Korshunov, brigade leader, Tashkent Chkalov Aviation Production Association, Uzbekistan;
Anatoliy Yevgenyevich Karpov, chairman of the Board of the Soviet Peace Foundation;
Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich Yevtushenko, secretary of the Board of the USSR Writers Union;
Pyusta Azizaga kyzy Azizbekova, director of the Museum of the History of Azerbaijan;
Nikolay Semenovich Glazkov, foreman and brigade leader, Moscow Artistic Clock Plant;
Vitautas Vitautovich Landsbergis, professor, Lithuanian SSR State Conservatory;
Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Mokan, Chairman of the Presidium of MSSR Supreme Soviet; and
Valeriy Vasilyevich Khmur, chairman of the ispolkom of the Olginskiy Village Soviet, Krasnodark Kray.

If everyone adheres to the rules, we will be able to give the floor to all of them.

Please allow me to give the floor to Aleksandr Yakovlevich Neumyvakin.

A.Ya. Neumyvakin, chairman of the Central Board of the All-Russian Society of the Blind, (from the Soviet Charity and Health Foundation): Dear comrade chairman! Dear comrade deputies! Comrades! This is the first time that the opportunity to speak from this high state rostrum has been given to a representative from public organizations of the disabled, from the founders of the Soviet Charity and Health Foundation. This attests to the positive changes occurring in our country which we have been discussing today at the congress. This is the first time that we have been given the opportunity to mention our critical problems, which are so numerous that it is necessary to take the most decisive steps.

Restructuring is under way in all social segments of our society. It is also under way in the societies of the disabled. We also have among us opponents of restructuring, conservatives, fault-finders, who do not propose anything themselves, but who accuse everyone of being unable to resolve the problems that have been accumulating over the years. The labor collectives of the societies of the disabled completely support restructuring both for the country as a whole, and within the confines of their own societies. For dozens of years we pretended that there was no problem with regard to the disabled. The mass media considered it to be incompatible with our understanding of humanitarianism to discuss the life of the disabled, or to show them on the television screens. But there were problems. They kept accumulating and becoming increasingly acute, until now more than 7 million disabled persons await major decisions from the deputies.

First of all, as my constituents feel and as I feel myself, it is necessary to resolve the question of pension payments. The miserly pension paid to disabled individuals and retirees who ended their labor activity long ago can no longer guarantee them a normal standard of living. It is necessary to raise the lowest limit of the pensions and grants-in-aid to a minimum of R100 and to do so immediately, beginning in 1990, if only for the disabled, prior to the promulgation of the Pension Law. Of course this will require funds, and, naturally, it will be necessary for all of us, comrades, to work together. And we are well aware of this. And especially, of course, it will be necessary for the minister of finance to work with the proposals concerning this question. But nevertheless I support here everyone who states that the question can

also be resolved by means of the intelligent reduction of the defense expenditures; by also—and I hope that my former colleagues will not be offended at me for saying so—conquering space jointly with other countries, which will prove to be less expensive; and by reducing the administrative apparatus and limiting the implementation of the idea of those enthusiasts who want to use state funds to divert the flow of rivers and to build stupendous canals that destroy the ecology, thus exerting an influence on people's health and, in the final analysis, leading to an increase in the number of disabled persons.

I completely support the idea of creating a Committee for Affairs of Veterans and Disabled Individuals. That committee must develop a draft of the Law Governing Organizations of the Disabled, since they have been dropped completely from the draft of the Law Governing Social Organizations. This will prevent a repetition of what is currently occurring, when, as various normative acts are published, our organizations are simply forgotten, or at best are equated to societies of anglers, philatelists, etc. You must realize that we understand the importance of these social organizations, but the disabled require a different approach. And this is not selfishness, but a vital necessity.

But you would not believe the obstacles that await us when we attempt to correct the situation! The Society of the Disabled proves to be in a situation when you simply do not know which God to pray to. For example, Decree 824, dated 17 July 1987, concerning the reduction of the administrative apparatus, was not extended to us. Later, by another decree, the reduction was carried out, but we were not granted the right to use the funds that had been made available, nor were we given the right to form a table of organization. For ten years the Society of the Blind attempted to remove the limitation on the earnings of Group II disabled individuals, which could not exceed R120 without affecting their pensions. Finally we achieved this. But the decision proved to be only a halfway measure that divided the disabled into two categories. The persons who received the right to get the benefits were those who work at production-training enterprises of societies of the blind, but the disabled persons working in state enterprises and in institutions did not receive that benefit. One can easily discern here the bureaucratic attitude of the apparatus, the workers of which, when preparing the documents, do not consider it to be necessary to coordinate the final version with those who are asking those questions.

The same thing occurred with the preparation of the Law Governing Public Organizations. My inquiries to the USSR Ministry of Justice and to the Institute of State and Law concerning this question have remained unanswered. Because of this attitude, and also relying upon the processes of restructuring, I began to disregard the so-called subordination of administrative levels, and sent our questions directly to Comrade Ryzhkov, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. So, Nikolay Ivanovich, it was I who who always bothered you. But it was only on your instructions that the societies in the republics managed to resolve as many as a dozen problems that had not been resolved previously.

The competency of the republic Councils of Ministers in resolving many questions is limited, and therefore we are forced to proceed—if you will pardon the expression—in battering-ram fashion, since we do not have any union agency. Here is an example. The percentage of reduction of passenger-car motor transportation that was established for the All-Russian Society of the Blind is the same as for any ministry. In Russia, 70 blind administrators of oblast, kray, autonomous, and republic boards of governors and 18 institutions each have one unit of transportation. For almost a year I attempted to prove that I cannot take away a car from a blind administrator in Tula, but allow one in Smolensk to keep his. And it was only on the basis of Nikolay Ivanovich's personal instructions that people began looking into our situation. And what do you think? They gave us allocations on the basis of the standards, and even more than I had fought for.

A person who has fallen upon hard times, who has become disabled, needs social rehabilitation. In recent years we have been given a large "replenishment" of internationalist fighting men. It is necessary first of all to help a person find his place in life, to help him feel that he is a worthy member of society, a person who is necessary to society—and for this purpose he needs a specialty; he needs work. Until recently there were public organizations only for persons who were disabled only in sight and hearing. About a year ago a society that unites the disabled in other categories was created, but for absolutely all disabled individuals, the problem of finding a job is an extremely important and acute one.

The legislation that is in effect has established for disabled individuals a reservation—2 percent of the jobs. But even within the confines of that reservation the administrators at enterprises and institutions do not want to give jobs to the disabled. Quotas for finding jobs for the disabled exist in many countries, but in those countries they are reinforced by penalty sanctions with respect to the enterprises that fail to meet them. Those fines are paid into a special fund for the disabled. I feel that it is time to change over to economic sanctions in our country also, so that the problems of the disabled can be resolved not only by the disabled individuals themselves, but also at the governmental level, by everyone. The persons with sight disability include the professor and instructor staff, teachers, jurists, and mathematician-programmers working at state enterprises and in institutions. These people request the leadership of the societies to provide their work stations with computers and other equipment that is designed to enable the blind to work normally and effectively. But they are afraid to direct these requests to the administrators of enterprises or organizations, lest conditions be created for them that will make it necessary to fire them. Are we really supposed to believe that a plant or an NII [scientific-research institute] is incapable of buying a computer—

even if it has to be bought in exchange for currency—or of creating the normal working conditions for a disabled person?

The societies of the blind and the deaf in all the union republics have their own enterprises. For example, the enterprise of the All-Russian Society of the Blind produces output with a total value of one billion rubles a year. More than 860 state plants and 41 ministries operate cooperatively with our enterprises. But the crux of the matter is not how many millions of rubles worth of output we produce—although this, too, is of no small importance for the country—but the tremendous amount of labor—and I am not exaggerating this—that the disabled have to expend in order to earn additional rubles to supplement their miserly pensions, in order at least to bring their income, on the whole, up to the average level of earnings in the country.

Involving disabled persons in socially beneficial labor proves to be a very difficult struggle at all administrative levels. Wherein is this expressed? First of all, it is necessary to select articles that would guarantee efficient working conditions for disabled persons, and we have selected them. For four years the recommendations from all the republic societies for the blind concerning the priority right for the production of those articles by disabled persons have been shelved. The ministries give as their reason the Law Governing the Enterprise, and put the blame on the rights of the labor collectives, and the labor collectives, in their turn, very frequently demonstrate both individual and group selfishness. What kind of charity is this? What kind of concern? Under such conditions, how is the administrator of the society supposed to act? How is he supposed to explain to the disabled persons the situation that has developed?

For example, the Ekran Plant in Kuybyshev, and the Chapayev Plant, as a result of the reduction of production of output for the defense industry, decided that the workers who had been made available should be kept busy with articles that disabled persons were making on the basis of cooperative efforts with the plant. Two months ago we were informed that, starting with the fourth quarter, the contract would be annulled. Two hundred disabled persons remain without work. Our enterprise is losing R19 million of volume of commercial output, with all the accompanying economic consequences. I would recommend that the plant engage in the production of other consumer goods, rather than taking work away from disabled persons. That would be much more beneficial both for the country and for Kuybyshev Oblast. It is possible to cite dozens of similar examples today. We are required to fulfill the plan just as any other ministry is required to, and we have more than enough controllers. But how do they guarantee our production? Exclusively according to the leftover principle. We are given, for the most part, obsolete equipment that has proven to be unneeded by enterprises in state industry—but there is not even enough of this, and yet we are responsible for the quality. Or I would like to cite an example with the provision of transportation. For 191 enterprises in the All-Russian Society of the Blind that are situated from Vladivostok to Kaliningrad, Gosplan provides 5-6 motor buses a year for transporting disabled persons to their place of work. Not a single electronic computer could help me to divide them. And you can imagine the difficulties that disabled people have in making their way to the enterprise on public transportation, especially during the wintertime. Recently—literally the day before yesterday—the Ministry of Trade delighted us by allocating for the society workers five motor vehicles, for sale to society workers. But I assume that we had so few vehicles allocated to us because they feel that blind people do not have to sit behind the steering wheel. I think that the Ministry of Trade is making a mistake, because we have people who have been working hand in hand with an unsighted person for 30 years, and we have veterans who deserve to be able, after accumulating the money needed, to buy a car. I think that, as I am speaking, the Ministry of Trade is reconsidering the decision that will add about a dozen units to the Society of the Blind. (Applause). Thank you.

Since 1951 the Society of the Blind has been living without any state subsidy, and everything that it does is done with money that has been earned by its own labor. And the society has done quite a bit. It has built enterprises, houses of culture, sanitoriums, special libraries, and apartment houses. But the income tax levied on the society's enterprises is the same that is levied on everyone else—35 percent. In our opinion, when resolving social problems, it is necessary to free disabled persons from paying this task. We could channel those funds into meeting the social needs of the disabled.

For a definite category of the disabled, work at home is acceptable. But just imagine a family of disabled persons living in a single room and also working there. They need housing.

Financial limits of R25 million a year are planned for the All-Russian Society of the Blind for capital construction. Of that amount, R16 million is for housing. But even this total, which is miserly for the RSFSR, also has to be divided among the collectives.

Normative documents have determined that 8 percent of the housing area is to be withdrawn by the local agencies to meet the city's needs. That is correct. But the situation that actually occurs in different. The Ulyanov Oblast Ispolkom wants to resolve the housing problem within the confines of its famous Zabota [Concern] program by withdrawing from the organizations of the disabled as much as 20 percent of the housing area constructed with the disabled persons's money. The Pskov and Novosibirsk ispolkoms have gone even farther. They want to take away more than 30 percent. The people in Rostov require, for each thousand of the financial limits for housing, R1400 of limits for developing the municipal management.

I request the Presidium to allow me to finish my statement.

Considering the fact that the limits are not being allocated any more to the society for these purposes, the claims of the ispolkom can only be satisfied at the expense of housing construction—if you do not like these terms, we will not include you in the share, and you won't get anything at all.... That's the entire concern shown for the disabled.

The Moscow City Oblispolkom owes 5000 square meters of housing area, but it refuses to allocate it, since the disabled persons were put on the waiting list later than the persons on the rayon's waiting list. But don't people realize that it is incomparably more difficult for a disabled person to live in a communal apartment? It is necessary to reconsider the benefits for disabled persons in this question. And also to decide the question, so that not a single construction plan is accepted without taking into consideration the specific nature of the disabled person's situation.

A very important problem that can be resolved at the state level is the providing of disabled persons with equipment that helps them to compensate for their physical shortcoming, that enables them to live and work to their fullest. As of today, we do not have enough of even the most elementary things. If one speaks about the blind, we lack the simplest dictaphones and high-grade paper for printing books in Braille. The quality of the production of these books is very low. The normal printing-house base does not exist. I am not even mentioning computers with voice or Braille output, which could be very helpful in providing jobs for the blind.

There are not enough special devices to enhance the hearing of deaf persons. And what about the problems of making prosthetic devices and of manufacturing wheelchairs? When are we going to stop applauding the Western companies and learn how to make these things ourselves? Where are our designers? How long is the minister of social security going to act in the role of a suppliant, or attempt by himself to get the leather, metal, and wood for the prosthetic devices? Incidentally, for purposes of an example, out of the wood that has been allocated, only 16 percent is suitable for prosthetic devices, and the rest is suitable only for use as firewood.

Good programs have been adopted to resolve these problems, but they are not being fulfilled. The "people at the bottom" are waiting for additional instructions, and the "people at the top" feel that everything is taking its course. When will we stop deceiving one another? It is necessary without delay, and in a real way, to achieve the elimination of the shortage of equipment that is vitally important for disabled persons.

Comrades, I have mentioned only a few of the problem. Because of the lack of time, I have not touched upon the topic of disabled children, or of disabled senior citizens who became disabled while working on kolkhozes or sovkhozes or at enterprises and for whom, only because they became members of the Society of Disabled Persons, the collectives have withdrawn all concern.

In conclusion I would like to appeal to our respected writers and journalists. In my opinion, it is time to stop arguing on the pages of the press about who used to take what position in the past. Because we need historical truth, we need works about present-day problems, about the present-day state of affairs. And I would like for the problems of the disabled to be illuminated objectively.

Just as new sprouts come out to replace the branches that have been broken off by the wind, just as everything living turns after the first rain toward the light and the heat, so do we disabled persons. For us, restructuring is the abundant rain, and the light and the heat are our hearts, your understanding. So please give some of the heat of your heats and your souls to the disabled. Help them to become truly equal members of society.

The year 1989 has been declared by the Soviet Charity and Health Foundation to be the Year of Charity. I call upon all of you, my dear deputies and voters, to join actively in this humanitarian movement. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: The floor is given to Deputy Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Korshunov. The next to speak will be Deputy Karpov.

A.A. Korshunov, brigade leader at the Tashkent V.P. Chkalov Air Production Association, Uzbek USSR, city of Tashkent (from the USSR Trade Unions): Comrade chairman, comrade deputies! My dear countrymen! I am a representative of the apparatus—an apparatus numbering 140 million persons—of Soviet trade unions. I am one of the representatives in the army of more than 20 million Soviet Communists. And I am forced to begin my statement not with what I had planned to speak about.

Certain speakers have attempted to convey the idea that the chief culprit for all our woes, for all our misfortunes, is the fact that, as is stated in Article 6 of the USSR Constitution, the guiding and directing force of Soviet society, the nucleus of its political system, is the CPSU. This has manifested itself especially clearly at the numerous rallies. I happened to be present at some of them. In the statements made by individual speakers, one hears a direct appeal: Separate the party from the management of the country, give physical reprisals to the Communists. It is not necessary to give physical reprisals to anyone. We have already gone through this, and so have our fathers and grandfathers. It is not necessary to give physical reprisals to people for their convictions. But separation from management is necessary, except that it should not be the party, but those who have penetrated into the party, those who, while hiding behind the party identification card, are obviously and secretly doing everything to prevent our restructuring from happening. (Applause).

There is no need to applaud, comrades. Otherwise I will not be able to say everything within my alloted time, and I will be asked to leave the rostrum. It would be better if you wait until later.

Yes, the party, like the other social institutions in our country, is living through a complicated time of renewal, of reinterpreting its role in the life of our country. Yes, the party and every communist bears a share of the responsibility for why, and with what, we have come to this congress, the responsibility for our failure in economics, for failures in the political area, responsibility for the crisis, for the aggravation of the interethnic relations, for the collapse of the financial system, and for many other things. Communists, of course, bear the responsibility for this. But, comrade deputies, the 1935 Communist deputies who are present here in this auditorium constitute 86 percent. Haven't the Communist Party and its leadership promoted the idea of restructuring our society, the idea of returning to Leninist principles, to democratization and glasnost, to the ideas of building a democratic, rule-of-law state? Do we have the right to forget that, thanks to April 1985, thanks to the 19th all-union party conference, it became possible to hold the election as a result of which we have proven to be here in this auditorium, and, in the final analysis, to conduct this congress? Who, if not the party, provided the impetus for the political and civic awakening of our society, of all the masses of the people, the impetus for the possibility of freely stating and defending any convictions?

There exist forces—and they are real ones—that are attempting to cross out our great, but simultaneously tragic, history. Those forces are attempting to dismember our union, to redesign the map of the country, to throw the country into the abyss of chaos and internecine struggle—and, in the muddy water of the anarchy of complete permissiveness, they are attempting to make political profit for themselves. They are rushing headlong to power, thinking least of all about the interests of our long-suffering nation. They have completely different goals. Nina Andreyeva, "Memorial," and the Democratic Union have nothing in common with democracy.

I would like to say two words about the Moscow group of deputies. For some reason, a few people are attempting to include them in this category. That is incorrect. I assert—and I think that I will be supported by a very large number of deputies—that the work of our Moscow comrades is largely helping us to understand how important it is not to be indifferent. From the delegations of the Baltic republics we are learning parliamentarianism, the culture of parliamentarianism. We all thank you greatly for this. (Applause).

A revolution is occurring in the country, and if that is so, then there is also a counterrevolution. Things must be called by their real names. It is the task of the congress to defend the revolution, and to prevent either the leftists or the rightists from killing the country's renewal, born with such difficulty, so agonizingly. Unfortunately, the process of restructuring has not yet become irreversible. And we, the highest agencies of power in the country, must work to create the mechanism for that irreversibility. I personally have apprehensions that the recently elected president of our country is not completely capable of implementing those ideas of restructuring, those very important structures of the rule-of-law state of which he himself is the author, and which have been supported by our entire society. I hope to God that I am mistaken! But I am not the only person who thinks this way.

There are forces that are preventing our president from implementing people's hopes. This manifests itself if only in the fact that all his precise, clear conceptions of restructuring are becoming bogged down in documents, beginning with the Council of Ministers and ending with the rayon executive committees. It is necessary to create a mechanism that makes a repetition of October 1964 impossible. The president of the country was elected by the congress, and it is only the congress that can release him from that job. The president of the country was elected by the congress, and the president must be accountable to the congress. We must not repeat our numerous cults in the Stalin or Brezhnev version. There is certainly little probability that Gorbachev has been subjected to this. But, nevertheless, first of all, he is not eternal, and, secondly, it is the law that must operate, rather than a good tsar or a kind administrator. (Applause).

Our society paid an immeasurably great price for allowing the power to be, for all practical purposes, in the hands of a single person. The entire fullness of the power must belong to us, to the Congress of People's Deputies. I am a deputy from the trade unions, and therefore I feel that the activity of the entire deputy corps—and especially its trade-union group—must be channeled, in the final analysis, toward the protection of the workers' rights, toward the improvement of the economy, and toward the creation of the conditions for the worthy, comfortable life of all segments of our society.

Comrades! Recently here in Moscow I met—this was not the first meeting, but, rather, there were many such meetings—with an elderly, poorly dressed woman. Seeing my deputy's lapel pin, she said to me, "You'll be there, and you will all keep talking and talking. But we were promised on television that we would get a raise in our pension. For 30 years I worked on a kolkhoz, and my son has moved to Moscow so that he can look after his granddaughter. Then, when he didn't need me anymore, he left me. The amount authorized for a man, a person who has died, is R36. How is a person supposed to live on that? I thought that I would get a raise in my pension, at least to pay for the burial expenses and to buy a mourning dress, but I don't think I can live that long. It's a good thing that my neighbors show Christian mercy in giving me things, in sharing their old clothes with me."

Believe me that it is shameful and painful to listen to this elderly woman, who has endured all the difficulties of our society and who has remained so hapless. It is

terrible that in the city of Moscow alone, more than 100,000 retirees receive this so-called pension of less than R50 a month. It is terrible that there are more than 10 million of them in the Soviet Union.

There has been an uncontrollable rise in prices, a washing away of the inexpensive assortment of commodities, and a worsening of their quality. Every day we see more and more empty shelves in the stores. According to statistical information, the unpaid and unsatisfied demand for commodities and services has reached R70 billion. But that is according to statistics. Our statistics can do anything. But according to estimates made by our scientists, that demand has exceeded 100 billion. Inflation constitutes approximately 5 percent a year, according to official data. And what about the real income? The State Committee for Statistics cheerfully asserts that during the past three years the real income in our country has increased by 8.3 percent.

One more question: For whom has it increased? It has become possible, without doing practically anything, to make superprofits. On the other hand, the highest economic agencies are making attempts to hold down the wages of the workers at the state enterprise. Panic has seized some of the population. It is completely impossible to imagine that it is is impossible to find, and in the capital of our motherland, too, such commodities as salt, matches, and soap. It is impossible to explain this by the years of stagnation. It is impossible to explain it by common sense.

The ecological catastrophe engulfing cities and entire regions. I shall not repeat a discussion of this. An excellent report on this was made by the representative from Soviet Uzbekistan, from Soviet Karakalpakia. Despite the solemn assurances of Comrade Chazov, USSR minister of public health, almost nothing is being done to improve the health of our people. Today these serious shortcomings can no longer be explained by the era of stagnation. One can see evidence of obvious failures in planning and in administration and of the imperfection of the economic mechanism.

In this regard I would like to make an oral deputy inquiry to Deputy Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers: Does our government have a clear-cut and concrete program for bringing our country out of the shameful position that has been created? Why is it that in the state sector of the economy the wages have been practically frozen until the end of the five-year plan, thus burying the cost accountability that has not yet had time to be born? Why is it that our cooperative system, which has been called upon to resolve the bottlenecks in production that were formed in the state sector and to saturate the markets with new and needed commodities and services, in many instances at the present time is living parasitically on our economic disorders? Essentially speaking, having produced (according to data provided by the same State Committee for Statistics) last year a total of R6 billion worth of commodities and services—which is a decent total—it has done absolutely nothing to improve the situation in our domestic market. The only things we see so far are kiosks filled with dubious pictures and figurines that corrupt the morality of our children, and not just our children. So far these are extravagant T-shirts, which, incidentally, are state-produced, onto which an appropriate design is slapped down and which are sold at outrageously high prices. How many times can one try to convince these fake cooperative members—I do not consider all of them to be such, because there also are honest ones—that they should not buy up in the state trade system meat and other scarce commodities? However, things happen as in the old saying, "Vaska listens, but keeps eating." In this instance, in my opinion, there are two ways out of the situation that has been created: Either chase Vaska away, or replace the cook. (Applause). The workers are in favor of the cooperative system, but one that will serve the interests of the nation. They are in favor of the civilized cooperative system that Ilich dreamed about.

The repeated statements by Comrade Komin, First Deputy Chairman of Goskomtsen [State Committee on Prices], and many of our respected scientists—Comrades Abalkin, Aganbegyan, Zaslavskaya—who spoke out in favor of the need for a reform in pricing without infringing on the rights of the consumers, have not yet led to anything good. The diktat of the producers manifests itself to an increasingly large degree precisely in the retail prices. May one ask where the work of observing a retail-price policy is being carried out? For the time being, our policy, Comrade Pavlov, only has a detrimental effect on the already empty pockets of the Soviet worker. I can judge from my own budget: three family members, R600 of earnings, are completely sufficient. The earnings have not been increasing, but my family's cost of living in the past two-three years increased on the average of 25-30 percent.

Taking into consideration the extraordinary economic situation in the country, as a worker deputy representing a deputy group of trade unions that defends the workers' interests, I demand the consideration, as early as the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, of the Pension Law, and the gradual putting of that law into effect starting 1 January 1990. A comrade has spoken here just now, and it was impossible to listen to him without feeling pain. It is necessary first of all—absolutely first of all—to increase the size of the pensions paid to workers, employees, disabled persons, and participants of the Great Patriotic War, and to bring their minimum amount up to the living wage. It is necessary to create a mechanism to assure that the minimum living wage is always observed and taken into consideration as the inflation and prices rise.

Comrade deputies! We must constantly be aware that the Soviet nation expects from us, from the congress, specific decisions dealing with the most vitally important questions. It expects us to carry away from this congress

a centrally controlled schedule for restructuring, a schedule that will consist not of slogans, but of specific assignments dealing with a specific question.

I was elected to our country's Supreme Soviet. I do not consider myself to be a 'gray mass,' as certain people imagine with respect to the working class. I have something to say. I have something to include in the agenda of the congress and the Supreme Soviet. And I have something to defend there. I feel that the other workers and kolkhoz members who are present here could do exactly the same thing.

Comrades! I call upon our congress to consolidate, to assure that there will be no more settling of personal accounts or insults here. The nation expects real decisions and real deeds from us because the country is standing on the line. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: The floor is given to Anatoliy Yevgenyevich Karpov. The next to speak after him will be Deputy Yevtushenko.

A.Ye. Karpov, chairman of the board of the Soviet Peace Foundation, Moscow (from the Soviet Peace Foundation jointly with five Soviet committees that are in favor of peace, solidarity, and international cooperation): Dear chairman! Dear deputies! Our congress is a model one both in the literal and in the figurative sense. Our countrymen are looking at us, and all of us together are attempting to consider yesterday's history, today's, and even tomorrow's. It is difficult, very difficult, to learn democracy, or the rules that govern good form in the 72nd year of the life of the state organism.

For the sake of illustration, I shall tell how the nomination of persons from Moscow to the Supreme Soviet of People's Deputies. There are 195 of us, and we received 29 of the places in the Soviet of the Union. It would seem that there would be nothing simpler than to select the best of the best and to give them our blessing. But we acted differently. We carried out a survey asking who wanted and who was able to work in the Supreme Soviet. That does not mean that we forgot the high honor of being in the Supreme Soviet. But being is one thing, and working is something completely different. Many of us have interesting work that we live, and leaving all of that suddenly.... Putting it more briefly, as you know, 55 persons expressed this desire. As a result, it was immediately proposed both to us and to you that the choice be made from the 195, but from the 55. The surplus principle triumphed—the persons who were candidates were not as many as were necessary, but as many as could be candidates and wanted to be. We left it for the congress to choose from them.

I would now like to discuss a few of the burning questions in the work of the Soviet Peace Foundation that I represent here.

First, the participation of the foundation in the conversion program, in other words, the reorientation of production from military to civilian. How does this seem to the nonspecialist? Yesterday the plant produced gunpowder, and a month later it produces nitrocellulose lacquers and viscose, since the raw materials are the same. Alas, everything is much more complicated. It is necessary to re-equip the production fundamentally, to change the technological scheme, and to retrain the cadres. All this requires not only funds, not only time, but also scientific substantiation. It is precisely that substantiation that finds the most economical, the most rapid path to conversion. Consequently, it makes sense to invest money, primarily into the scientific substantiation, in order to win both time and funds, and to assure that the conversion lasts not five to ten years, as certain specialists coolly consider, but perhaps two to three years.

We are engaging in this and are financing scientific developments. But here is something that is strange. The scientists are proceeding along this path as though it is being traveled for the first time, although actually the road has been well-traveled for a long time. As long ago as the 1940's, after the Great Patriotic War, a state agency for conversion was created in our country, and under its guidance our industry was able to restructure itself. You will say that during these years production has moved far ahead. Yes, that is correct. But the principles of conversion remain unchanged. So have the ideas, but they are kept carefully hidden by the notorious secrecy. Only a few people have access, but the number of production entities being restructured is in the hundreds, and thousands of specialists will deal with them. It would seem that there is no need to prove anything here. These materials must be opened up for them. Proceeding from this hypothesis, I propose that the Supreme Soviet immediately engage in developing a law governing conversion, and that it simultaneously instruct the government to create a Conversion Planning and Support Council, that possesses high powers and the opportunity to coordinate the resolution of this problem in a comprehensive manner. The departmental approach here is simply ruinous, as well as impossible.

For purposes of information, I can say that in the United States a bill concerning conversion was introduced in Congress for the first time in 1963, and since that time it has been repeatedly discussed at various levels. And recently the question of creating a Conversion Planning and Support Council was considered.

Second. I shall not explain the kind of poverty our disabled people are living in. Everyone knows this. There are 7 million of them in the country, of whom 1.5 million are disabled war veterans. The number of the latter is actually considerably greater, inasmuch as, according to physicians, today practically every participant in the Great Patriotic War has grounds for qualifying as a disabled individual. And how many disabled children are there?

It may be that not all of you know that in 1988 the USSR Council of Ministers issued a decree to increase the standard expenditures for food and medicines at boarding homes for senior citizens and the disabled. It had previously been proposed to do that in late 1990. For us who are strong and healthy, waiting two years is no problem. But what about those people for whom every day of their life is being counted? Are they supposed to wait two years until they are fed, or until a nurse brings them a pill at their first request? And so, while the government is gathering momentum, the Soviet Peace Foundation decided: The decree will go into effect as of January 1989, but with funds from the foundation—because we are already subsidizing the construction of hospitals for veterans and internationalist fighting men; a social assistance center for single individuals, senior citizens, and soldiers' widows; and the development of the production of prosthetic devices for adults and children.

But how annoying it is if there is a good idea and there is money, but nothing is being done! For example, for many years no one has been able to resolve the question of constructing a therapeutic center for victims of the blockade in Leningrad. The question of building a hospital for disabled war veterans and internationalist fighting men in Alma-Ata has drowned in a flood of papers.

The problems of improving the living conditions for disabled persons and for low-income retirees are our common pain, our common concern, and they must be resolved immediately. In this regard I would like to support Deputy Korshunov and make to specific proposals.

First. We should resolve the question of establishing the minimum pension level to R75 for all categories of our country's population, including the rural population. (Applause).

You might ask, why 75 rubles? Well, it is because that is the minimum living wage in our country.

Second. At one time our party's program stated that by 1980 all the citizens of the country could travel on urban transportation free of charge. Well, then, let's fulfill that promise ten years later, at least for disabled person, persons with low income, and senior citizens! The funds for this purpose must be sought, of course, by the government. On my part I want to say that our foundation is ready to cooperate actively in resolving these questions, both with the government and with public organizations and foundations.

We have already had experience in this kind of cooperation. True, it has taken different directions. For example, two years ago we decreed that R120 million would be allocated to help homes for orphaned children. But at exactly the same time the Lenin Children's Foundation, that is well known to you, was being born, and we thought it would be an excellent thing if our help to the orphans went through their hands. Because it is not important who among us will do it; what is important is that there is a result. And we did not doubt for even a minute that there would not be a result, inasmuch as the Children's Foundation is headed by our associate Albert Anatolyevich Likhanov, a well-known and respected person who has done a lot for children. Since that time, I will remind you, two years have passed. But we have been completely unable to obtain the address of even a single children's home to which we could send our money. Currently a large number of new problems have arisen, and Deputy Likhanov has spoken in an anxious and ardent manner about them. But we hope that our money will finally get to the children.

On my part I would like to say that our foundation is also ready in the future to take the most active part in protecting childhood.

Since the subject has swung around to foundations, I would like to allow myself a small comment. Recently a large number of them have been formed. It has become fashionable: whatever it is, give us a foundation and democracy.... It would seem that we ought to be pleased by this, because any foundation is a noble movement. But whereas we have already matured for this politically, economically we are by no means ready for it. Because any foundation is people's contributions. And how much can a person contribute if he is barely able to make ends meet? Consequently, however noble the ideas of many new foundations may be, they are doomed from the start to vegetate. And a poor foundation is nonsense. If it does not have any money with which to fulfill its function, why is it needed? We have several large-scale, strong foundations: culture, children's, charity, peace.... Why not open up for them special-purpose accounts, instead of organizing a new foundation every time?

And, finally, a topic which for several days has been disturbing our congress and which I also cannot ignore, as it is because of this topic that the Peace Foundation was created. It is internationalism, or, to put it more precisely, the brotherhood of people who are united by the idea of creating the common weal. We have attended all its universities, we have been proud of it, and we have convinced ourselves and others that universal brotherhood is a law in our life. Suddenly blow followed blow: the problem of Karabakh, the tragic events in Sumgait and Tbilisi.... It would seem that those are the places where we could have learned the difficult lessons that could have aroused us and forced us to look at everything realistically. But no, we did not learn anything. We keep talking and talking—we do nothing but keep talking, as though we can use words to persuade an Estonian to defend his history differently, and can use words to reconcile the Azerbaijanis and the Armenians.

What, then, can I recommend in this regard?

First. It is necessary to reconsider fundamentally the curriculum for educating and instructing children in schools and nonschool institutions, and to provide to

children and to young men and women broad access to the spiritual wealth of our country's nations, to their traditions, history, culture, and faith. Otherwise we shall have a paradoxical situation in which our children have a better knowledge about faraway Australia than they do of a neighboring republic. But most importantly, it is necessary to return to all nations a genuine, rather than petty-bourgeois, nationalistic interpretation of the concept "the citizen's national dignity," and a Leninist interpretation that was succinctly and clearly formulated in his excellent work "The National Pride of the Great Russians."

As long as I have touched upon this topic, I would like to allow myself a small digression. I miss, for example, at our historic constituent congress—behind the presidium—a map of our great, long-suffering homeland, a homeland that was created by many generations of our ancestors who were directed by the hand of history.

And in conclusion I would like to say: Yes, we are all learning democracy, but it is important for us not to keep sitting in noisy primary classrooms, but, having passed at our congress the examination for the right to be called a people's deputy, we must take more energetic steps to achieve the practical resolution of the vitally important tasks of restructuring.

My statement does not include an exposition of my concept or program for this extraordinarly complicated process of renewal. But I would like to touch upon three problems.

First. In 1917 we demanded the transfer of power to the soviets, guaranteeing that the land would be given back to the peasants. We must fulfill the promise that was made to the nation by the party.

Second. For several years we have been caught in the quagmire of phrase-mongering, as we were growing some special kind of spirituality. Every nation has the right to its uniqueness, a right that has been gained by millenia of sufferings, and, one might say, a genetic right. So we shall respect that part of a nation's being, that part of its culture.

And third. It is time to put an end to the mean trick that annihilates the individual—the name of which is across-the-board leveling—because the time that has been alloted to us by history is running considerably faster than the chess player's timer. And the nation wants to believe us, wants to believe that our team is capable of beating the clock at this historic point in history. Thank you. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: The floor is granted to Deputy Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich Yevtushenko, secretary of the board of the USSR Writers Union. The next person to speak after him will be Deputy Azizbekova.

Ye.A. Yevtushenko, (Kharkov-Dzerzhinskiy Electoral District, Ukrainian SSR): My dear comrades, it is no easy matter to sow the seeds of restructuring in soil with cracks of national enmity. What good are toasts to the friendship of nations when, under the legs of the banquet table, blood is flowing! The friendship of nations must be begun even before a child enters school. It must begin as early as the kindergarten, the street, the bus, and the store, where, to our shame, it is still possible from time to time to hear insulting terms applied to people of other nationalities—terms such as "khokhlyandiya," "katsap," "zhid," "armyashka," "chuchmek," "chukhonet," "katsoshka," etc.

To develop the idea expressed by deputies Likhachev, Gorbunov, and Oleynik, I propose a new article in Chapter 9 of the USSR Constitution: "The sovereignty and national dignity of each republic of the USSR are guaranteed by all the other republics. The insulting of any nation, even the smallest one, or disrespect for its language, laws, culture, economy, customs, beliefs, and expression of its will, are considered to be the criminally punishable insulting of all the Soviet nations." (Applause).

It is impossible to wash oneself clean of the past if there is no soap.

The so-called "strong hand" is always ready to grow ominously onto the breakable body of a weak economy. If there is no democracy in the economy, then democracy is threatened everywhere. The undemocratic nature of the economy is explained first of all by a personality cult that has never ended in our country—the cult of the personality of the state. The document that was read aloud here in the name of our long-suffering peasantry is a cry from the land itself, a land that is being raped by the endless decrees that contradict one another, decrees concerning how that land should live, what that land should do, and what it should not do. With regard to this point I share the deep pain of my long-time opponent Vasily Belov, but with regard to other points we are still arguing. Continuing Adamovich's idea, I propose overruling, by a special decree of the Supreme Soviet, absolutely all verdicts applied to the "expropriated kulaks," thus admitting finally the fault of our society, a society that criminally allowed the taking away of the land from its true owners. (Applause). Supporting Starodubtsev, I propose removing from Article 19 of the USSR Constitution the insulting and foolish formulation concerning the need to erase the boundaries between the city and the village, a formulation which actually has erased so many villages from the face of the earth. I propose throwing out of the Constitution completely Article 22, concerning the conversion of rural labor into a variety of industrial labor, which is something that belittles and primitivizes the great poetic profession of farmer. (Applause).

The cult of the personality of the state also had a detrimental influence on industry, which long ago became not only a long-term construction project, but a perpetual construction project for the "happy future."

Bridge builders add salt to the construction mortar so that the mortar will "grab." But if they hurriedly put in too much salt, it will subsequently erode the iron armature. Our economy is like that kind of oversalted bridge that has been eroded by corrosion, a bridge whose interminable repairs have exceeded the cost of the bridge itself. The branch ministries are like inflated repair-and-construction offices, and Gosplan is sometimes like a gigantic shop where minor repairs are made to clothing worn by the emperor without clothes. (Stirring in the auditorium, applause). The cult of the personality of the state led to state monopolism. The state, having monopolized all the basic production—from paper clips to missiles—began to resemble a clumsy dinosaur with rickety legs bending under the weight of its body, and with a tiny brain in its head, situated too far from the tail. The state's monopoly on enterprises and the land is not the socialism that had been envisaged by Lenin, but instead is some kind of semifeudal, antistate state capitalism. It is antistate because it is not profitable for the state itself. The indicator of the strength of the state is not the number of those who have a spoon, but the standard of living of those who have a wooden plow. To be as poor as we are, despite all this phenomenal natural wealth, is indisputable proof of the lack of prospects for the cult of the personality of the state, of state monopolism. It is necessary to give freedom to creativity, including economic creativity, not only to the intellectuals, but to all the workers, peasants, employees, and the intellectuals.

Article 40 of the Constitution, which begins with the words "The citizens of the USSR have the right to work," is not only primitive, but also insulting. Even prisoners are citizens, and they also have the right to work.

I propose a new wording for Article 40: "The citizens of the USSR have the right to free labor. Free labor means the free choice of labor: collective, family, individual, state, kolkhoz, cooperative, joint-stock, or lease. Free labor means the right to purchase producer goods from the state, as well as the right to produce producer goods. Farmers have the right to own the land as their basic means of production. Land is provided by the local soviets for a term of up to one hundred years, with the right of inheritance. Free labor is the right to sell the products of one's labor at a price determined by the producer wherever the producer himself decides. Free labor is the right of the producers, after paying state taxes, to determine for themselves the wage fund and the development. Free labor is the right to produce not what has been forcibly dictated from above, but what is dictated by the needs of the market, by the nation's needs."

I propose removing from the preamble of the USSR Constitution the boastful, jingoistic formulation: "A developed socialist society has been constructed in the USSR." It is necessary first to construct it, and then to brag about it. It would be desirable to reduce, and in a number of instances to discontinue, the aid provided to the poorly developed countries until our own country becomes highly developed. (Applause).

My constitutents are from the city of Kharkov, which is a kind of Leningrad of the Ukraine, a place where the intellectual working class and the truly worker's intelligentsia have given me a mandate—a stern mandate—to introduce into Chapter 7 of the Constitution the following article: "Citizens of the USSR, irrespective of their party, state, or social status, possess only equal rights with all other workers in the sphere of trade services and in the sphere of public health. The existence in open or concealed form of privileged special stores, special drug stores, or special hospitals is considered to be an unconstitutional violation of the principles of socialist equality." (Applause).

Comrades! Of course there must be deputy privileges. With today's situation with tickets, we unfortunately need deputy cash offices, and we need to be assured of finding a room quickly in hotels, because of the importance of the people's assignments. But, comrades, having luxurious deputy rooms at airports and train stations when, right nearby, women, children, and old men are sleeping side by side on the floor, is absolutely shameful! (Applause). We all make up the Congress of People's Deputies—the highest agency of power. Let us, with the authorization of the presiding officer at this meeting, carry out now at least one tiny, modest piece of magic for democracy. Let us vote to have all the deputy rooms turned over for use as rooms for mothers with children and for senior citizens. (Applause. The speaker holds up his identification card. The audience supports him.) Thank you for your support!

Lenin, in a speech at a meeting dedicated to his 50th birthday, prophetically stated, "...our party may possibly find itself in a very dangerous position, I believe—namely the position of a person who has become conceited. That position is rather stupid, shameful, and ridiculous." (V.I. Lenin, PSS [Complete Collected Works], Vol 40, pp 326-327.)

But, comrades, didn't we have that conceit, that party self-decoration, that party self-glorification, when the portraits of leaders, the slogans "Glory to the CPSU," etc., were contrasted with the murders of millions of workers, with personal corruption, with the collapse of the economy, and with the death of our irreplaceable boys in Afghanistan?

The historical merit of the creative segment of the party and of M.S. Gorbachev personally is that they bravely took a course based on a new way of thinking. But the new way of thinking is incompatible with the previous inert party monopolism on promoting soviet and state administrative cadres. Our country has approximately 20 million party members. But we have approximately 100 million non-party adults! They constitute an inexhaustible golden reserve of potential administrative cadres, but we are continuing to play with this same greasy pack of nomenklatura cards. The country does not have a single non-party USSR minister. You can look high and low, but you won't find a non-party general director. So far as I know, the entire country has only one

non-party minister on the republic level—Raymond Pauls—and only one non-party editor of an all-union magazine—Sergey Zalygin, both of whom, at any rate, ought to be included in the Red Book. I could not comprehend here the statements about attacks on the party that had allegedly been organized by the "dark forces" at our congress. There are a total of 292 non-party members here, that is, less than 13 percent. What has been said here, comrades, is, practically speaking, only an intraparty discussion! Neither Academician Likhachev, nor Father Pitirim, spoke against the party. We've had enough of this "enemy-mania"! Those 38 party committee secretaries who were not elected also should not explain this by attacks on the party. It was simply the nation's negative evaluation of their personal actions. (Applause).

We respect the party for all the best things that it has done and is doing, and we believe that it can do a lot more, but we do not need anyone's new individual personality cult, or a party cult.

Mikhail Sergeyevich, you remember that now you are not only the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, but also the president of the party of 100 million non-party members, and we non-party members ask you not to allow in the future this kind of cadre suppression in our country. All of us—party members and non-party members—must be in a single indivisible party—the party of the nation!

I propose an additional article in Chapter 7 of the USSR Constitution: "Citizens of the USSR, irrespective of their status as party member or non-party member, have the right to complete equality when being nominated to fill any Soviet state positions, including the highest ones."

I also propose changing the text of Article 6 to read as follows: "In accordance with the Bolsheviks' historic slogan 'All power to the soviets,' the chief guiding and directing force of Soviet society is the soviets of people's deputies—a completely equal union of party members and non-party members on the basis of the ideas of socialism. The highest agency of power is the Congress of People's Deputies."

I propose, by means of a special decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the overruling of the sentences dealing with all the so-called dissident trials. I propose returning Soviet citizenship to all those from whom it was unjustly taken away. I propose limiting the rights to practicing medicine for all psychiatrists who, violating their Hippocratic oath, labeled normal free-thinking people as dissidents and crammed them into mental hospitals.

In developing Drutse's proposal, and proceeding from my own deep respect for our Army, I propose adding the following amendment to Article 31 of the USSR Constitution, to read: "By its blood the Soviet Army has earned the noble reputation of the saviour of the world from fascism, and no one has the right to force it to be used in punitive actions either against the Soviet nations, or against other nations. State officials who issue such unconstitutional orders must be taken to court."

I propose canceling not only Article 11.1 of the 8 April decree, according to which it is possible to make criminally accountable any superior individuals who have made justified criticism, but also to reconsider completely this extremely sloppy and dangerous decree. It contains, for example, a ludicrous "spy-mania" paragraph concerning so-called "foreign copying equipment," as though all our stores are crammed full of our own Soviet-produced Xerox machines. We might note that the thesis of acceleration, in general, has almost disappeared, and even Mikhail Sergeyevich does not repeat it any more. Why? Well, it is because there are no means of acceleration, and Xerox is one of them. So, instead of Vasiliy Ivanovich Belov's vigilant thesis, which is approximately that "Every Xerox machine must be kept under scrutiny," I propose the thesis: "Every Soviet citizen should have his own personal Xerox machine." It may be that a Xerox machine will help even Vasiliy Ivanovich in his work as a writer. (Applause).

I shall be finishing soon, comrades. I still have three minutes remaining. I propose opening up as the official newsletter of the Congress of People's Deputies a permanent union-wide newspaper, GOLOS DEPUTATA [Voice of the Deputy], with an unlimited subscription. This newspaper should be made the responsibility of an editor who is a non-party member, if only for the sake of conducting a unique experiment.

I recommend announcing a competition for a new Anthem of the Soviet Union, since the words in the current one have become hopelessly obsolete.

I propose the following changes in the Election Law: "The election must be universal, equal, direct, and secret. There must be no district meetings. All single-mandate elections, including elections of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, will henceforth be considered invalid. All organizations, including the party, have the right only to nominate candidates. The right to elect is retained by the chief organization—the nation."

Comrades! Why did we win the Great Patriotic War? Because we all had both the desire to achieve a common victory and a sense of having a common enemy. Let us not look for enemies in one another, since we all have common enemies. They are the threat of a nuclear war, terrible natural calamities, ethnic conflicts, economic depression, ecological misfortunes, and the bureaucratic quagmire.

Restructuring is not only our spiritual revolution, but is our second Great Patriotic War. We do not have the right not to be victorious in it, but that victory must not cost us any human victims. Thank you. (Applause).

B.Ye. Paton: The floor is granted to Deputy Pyusta Azizaga kyzy Azizbekova. The next person to speak will be Deputy Gustov.

P.A. Azizbekova, director of the Museum of the History of Azerbaijan, Baku (Baku-Azizbekovskiy National-Territorial Electoral District, Azerbaijan SSR): Comrade deputies! I obviously have been unlucky. Not only have a small number of women deputies been given the floor, but I have been scheduled after such an emotional speaker as our favorite poet Yevtushenko. But I think that you will help me.

M.S. Gorbachev: Women always have a difficult position.

P.A. Azizbekova: Yes. Things in general are not so easy for us nowadays. It is not so easy to give birth to a Soviet Parliament, to form the mechanism of democracy. Sometimes the work of the congress, as we have all seen, is shaken up by sharp discussions. We need conflicts between various positions and points of view. Every day, every session, convinces us of how important, how necessary, it is to search for the answers to questions that will determine our fate. What will our future life be like? How can we move ahead in these difficult times, when the nation is attentively observing our work, when people are waiting for us to provide an answer to all the questions that are troubling them? There are a very large number of questions, in all spheres of life.

I would like, comrade deputies, to dwell on certain problems that were raised in Mikhail Seregeyevich Gorbachev's report. They are ethnic questions. The social, political, and civic participation of our people, who have been aroused by restructuring and glasnost, is a great force. And yet the inertia of the stagnation has by no means been overcome—this is attested to by literally every statement made by deputies—and it takes considerable efforts to assure that the energy of ideas is converted into the energy of movements. True, this is a hackneyed expression, but it must be said here today. It is necessary to place in the service of this idea all the opportunities, all the potential that our all nations and nationalities have, including my own nation, the Azerbaijani nation. No one doubts that each of the national republics that form the Soviet Union has its own specific peculiarities, which find reflection in the variety of its economic, social, and spiritual development. Hence the obvious conclusion: We should not copy one another in creating various political institutions or economic models. But there is a persistent need to create union-wide laws that precisely regulate the combining of the interests both of the USSR and our national union republics. The general principles of restructuring the management of the economy are creating the foundations on which the all-union legislation in this direction should develop. And I would like very much, comrade deputies, for the laws that will be developed by us to be long-lived.

Today one hears increasingly frequent appeals, essentially speaking, to dismantle the foundations of the very constitutional structure of our multinational state. However, all those who make such declarations, it seems to me, express not common-ethnic interests, but group ones. And therefore the question arises: Doesn't this lead to a breaking of ties not only with the center, but also among the republics, to the distortion of the economic relations that have formed, and to the destruction of the unique Soviet culture, which is a very important factor in developing and integrating the socialist nations? Our descendants will not forgive us if we allow a global spiritual "autonomization," or national self-isolation, which will inevitably lead to alienation, and to the weakening of the entire union and each republic individually.

Today, comrade deputies, we are facing the fact of serious nationalistic manifestations in certain regions of the country, including our region. From our own bitter experience we know the misfortune to which the attempts to estrange people on the basis of nationality lead. Simply the asking of the question of redrawing the borders, the unsubstantiated demands to include NKAO in Armenian SSR, became the reason for the destablization of the situation in the region and led to an interethnic conflict. The economic ties and the traditional bonds of friendship were broken. The misfortune that occurred in the region will have an effect for a long time on the fates of people and of entire generations. The scope of the tragedy is too great. Approximately 300,000 refugees from both republics—Armenia and Azerbaijan—have been left without a roof over their heads. Currently 50,000 Armenian inhabitants who left Azerbaijan have returned to their previous places of residence, and we are very glad. We want very much for the 165,000 Azerbaijanis who are living in Armenia but who currently have concentrated among us in Azerbaijan to return to their previous places of residence. The refugees today are a frightening picture, and this is not a regional problem, comrades. The inhabitants of the nonindigenous nationality in other republics where the interethnic conflicts are coming to a head may also find themselves in the position of refugees. It is urgently necessary to involve in this problem the country's legislative agencies; it is necessary to restore the justice that has been trampled upon, to guarantee legal protection to those who have suffered, and to compensate them for the material losses that they have incurred. The problem of the refugees can be resolved, but only if there is the strictest observance of the letter and spirit of the law. We adhere to this principle only.

Despite the entire complexity of the situation in NKAO and all the difficulties and road blocks on the path of normalizing it, I am convinced that this is a resolvable problem. For purposes of normalizing the situation in NKAO, a specific form of administration has been introduced and a Committee of Special Administration has been created. We feel that, in the situation that has been created, the correct compromise decision was made—a decision that is capable of playing a positive

role in overcoming the interethnic conflict and in normalizing the interethnic relations in the oblast. During the period that has elapsed, the committee has done a large amount of work on this path, but its activity could be more effective if it were not openly hampered by the anti-restructuring forces that inspire strikes, and the obstruction of the decisions made by the central agencies. Many deputies who spoke at the congress spoke bitterly and painfully about the serious economic and financial situation that has developed in the country. But under these conditions, the amount of money allocated to meet the needs of the oblast and to develop the NKAO of Azerbaijan SSR was—take note of this—a half billion rubles. However, for unexplainable reasons, that help, practically speaking, is being rejected. We need good will and a genuine desire to collaborate if effective use is to be made of the opportunities granted for normalizing the situation and for accelerating the development of the oblast. Creative work is needed.

A fundamental question that requires just as fundamental an answer is an idea that was expressed here—the idea that national feelings, national interests, must dominate over class solidarity. This is a dangerous opposing of two absolutely fundamental factors in our political philosophy. Wherever it is proposed to select one principle out of two, there is obviously a lack of any precise fundamental delineation between the genuine national interests, which never can be opposed to ideas of the solidarity and unity of nations or to nationalistic distortions.

In the history of our nations of the Transcaucasus, there have already been tragic events that were provoked by frenzied nationalists. During those tragic moments there were leaders who were capable of reconciling the fraternal nations that had lived in friendship and harmony for centuries. I am proud that they included my own own grandfather, Meshadi Azizbekov—one of the 26 Baku commissars.

Continuing these traditions, I call upon everyone to reinforce the friendship, and to reconcile those who have forgotten about the bread and salt that our nations shared for centuries and that strengthened our friendship and sacred brotherhood. It would be naive to assume that the conflict will resolve itself. This will require the carrying out of prolonged and painstaking joint work by the healthy patriotic forces of the two nations, the most delicate political actions of party organizations, and the purposeful unification of the efforts of the deputies from Armenia and Azerbaijan, who have been freed of the heavy load of reciprocal insults and prejudices, and who are capable of boldly opposing the blackmail of the anti-restructuring forces.

I want to convey words of genuine gratitude from our voters, and from the entire Azerbaijani nation, to the deputies—Metropolitan Pitirim, M.N. Rakhmanova, and others—who, having penetrated deeply into the complexity of the situation in our region, raised their voices in a heartfelt and wise appeal to reason, restraint, and mutual understanding. The numerous telegrams and telephone calls from our voters enable me to assure you that their words are finding a direct response in the hearts of people who found themselves, for reasons that were not under their control, in the maelstrom of the complicated dramatic events.

Comrade deputies! The seriousness of the situation that has developed can be judged if only from the fact that even such sacred words for us as "the friendship and brotherhood of nations" and "internationalism" seem to others to be but empty phrases. Concern for the fates of the republic and the entire country permeates the letter sent by the deputies from Azerbaijan to Comrade Gorbachev, General Secretary of CPSU Central Committee. Included among the signatures at the bottom of that letter is my own. I am returning to this document because I want everyone to know what we are striving for. We are demanding that, in practice, the supremacy of the law be carried out. We are striving for the taking of decisive steps to stop the attempts to destabilize the situation, regardless of who originates those attempts.

In our republic, the prerequisites have been created for a constructive dialogue within the confines of the Constitution that is in effect, and for a mutual striving to eliminate the conflict that is unnatural for a socialist society. Today the center of gravity must be shifted, to use Lenin's words, "not so much to describing what we have experienced, as to pointing out the experience that we are obtaining and that we must obtain for our direct practical activity" ("Poln. sobr. soch." [Complete Collected Works], Vol 39, p 342). Comrade deputies, you can be assured: The Azerbaijani nation, true to its friendship with all the fraternal nations of the USSR, will always remain a genuine and true internationalist.

One last word: Comrade deputies, I support the opinion expressed by author Deputy Belov concerning the respectful attitude to the president of our great state. But I cannot share the opinion of those who assume that Mikhail Sergeyevich is standing off to one side of restructuring. Comrade Gorbachev has been and still is, has been marching and still is marching, in the vanguard of the revolutionary restructuring of our society. Thank you for your attention. (Applause).

The continuation of the stenographic record will be published in the next issue.